

First Lieut. William H. Cushing, of New York, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Louis N. Stodder, retired.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Infantry Arm.

Capt. James B. Goe, Thirteenth Infantry, to be major, April 15, 1902, vice Huston, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Hunter Liggett, Fifth Infantry, to be major, May 5, 1902, vice Wittich, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Henry M. Dichmann, Seventh Infantry, to be captain (subject to examination required by law), April 15, 1902, vice Goe, Thirteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Halstead Dorey, Fourth Infantry, to be captain, May 5, 1902, vice Liggett, Fifth Infantry, promoted.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

Infantry Arm.

Post Q. M. Sergt. Staley A. Campbell, United States Army, to be second lieutenant, Feb. 2, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

Clarence Hale, of Portland, Me., to be United States district judge for the district of Maine, vice Nathan Webb, resigned, to take effect July 1, 1902.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 13, 1902.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Asst. Surg. Hill Hastings, of Kentucky, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from March 29, 1902.

Asst. Surg. Claude H. Lavinder, of Virginia, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from March 27, 1902.

Asst. Surg. Taliaferro Clark, of Virginia, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from March 27, 1902.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

William E. Bundy, of Ohio, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Ohio.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Lorenzo R. Thomas, of Idaho, to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

George A. Robethan, of Pocatello, Idaho, to be receiver of public moneys at Blackfoot, Idaho.

INDIAN AGENT.

Caleb B. Jackson, of South Dakota, to be agent for the Indians of the Sisseton Agency in South Dakota.

TERRITORIAL ASSOCIATE JUSTICES.

J. L. Pancoast, of Oklahoma, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma.

Frank E. Gillette, of Oklahoma, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma.

James K. Beauchamp, of Oklahoma, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma.

POSTMASTERS.

William D. Ingram, to be postmaster at Lincoln, in the county of Placer and State of California.

George J. McCabe, to be postmaster at Bisbee, in the county of Cochise and Territory of Arizona.

W. J. Hill, to be postmaster at Salinas, in the county of Monterey and State of California.

Shelley Inch, to be postmaster at Placerville, in the county of Eldorado and State of California.

Charles G. Chamberlain, to be postmaster at Pacific Grove, in the county of Monterey and State of California.

Henry Osterheld, to be postmaster at Yonkers, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

Arthur J. Hudson, to be postmaster at Clifton, in the county of Graham and Territory of Arizona.

Dick M. Kirby, to be postmaster at Palatka, in the county of Putnam and State of Florida.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, May 13, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.
Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.
The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up a conference report, which the Clerk will read.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire if this is a conference report on what is known as the omnibus claims bill?

Mr. MAHON. The omnibus bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to raise a point of order against the conference report at the proper time.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read instead of the report. The statement explains everything.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the reading of the report be omitted, and that the statement only be read. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire that the statement and report be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama objects. The Clerk will read both the report and the statement.

The report of the committee of conference was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 8 of said Senate amendment, between lines numbered 15 and 16, insert the following:

"To Charles M. Flower, Frank S. Flower, William Flower, and D. Sprigg Flower, children of Charles H. Flower, deceased, of Rapides Parish, \$23,357."

On page 10 of said Senate amendment, between lines numbered 18 and 19, insert the following:

"To Henry R. Walton, administrator of John Walton, deceased, of Anne Arundel County, \$5,063."

"To William S. Tildon, of Harford County, \$330."

On page 14 of said Senate amendment, between lines numbered 23 and 24, insert the following:

"To John W. Hancock, of Iron County, \$1,160."

On page 24 of said Senate amendment, between lines numbered 17 and 18, insert the following:

"To William B. Horner, late of Shelby County, \$1,250."

"To W. H. Robertson, administrator of Emma Robertson, deceased (formerly Emma M. Mayo); H. P. Hobson, administrator of Lucy Mayo, deceased, and Sarah Agnes Bumpass, heirs of F. W. Mayo, deceased, of Fayette County, \$74."

On page 25 of said Senate amendment, between lines numbered 9 and 10, insert the following:

"To Mary E. O. Dashiell, late of Norfolk County, \$510."

On page 29 of said Senate amendment, in line numbered 22, strike out the words "James C. Hays, administrator de bonis non," and insert in lieu thereof the words "Titus C. Hammond, administrator with the will annexed."

On page 76 of said Senate amendment, in line numbered 2, strike out the words "Hannah E. Boardman" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Fannie J. Nagle."

On page 78 of said Senate amendment, in lines numbered 6 and 7, strike out the words "forty-four thousand and fifteen dollars and eighty-four cents" and insert in lieu thereof the words "forty thousand three hundred and twenty-one dollars and three cents."

On page 79 of said Senate amendment, in line numbered 18, strike out the words "J. Simonson" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the legal representatives of J. Simonson, deceased."

On page 79 of said Senate amendment, in lines numbered 21, 22, and 23, strike out the words "to the contractors or their personal representatives, \$113,543," and insert in lieu thereof the words "to the surviving partner of the constructors, \$87,615.67."

On page 86 of said Senate amendment strike out lines numbered 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the claim of the State of Nevada for costs, charges, and expenses incurred by the Territory of Nevada for enrolling, subsisting, clothing, supplying, arming, equipping, paying, and transporting its troops employed in aiding to suppress the insurrection against the United States, war of 1861-1865, under the act of Congress of July 27, 1861 (12 Stats., p. 276), and joint resolution of March 8, 1862 (12 Stats., p. 615), as interpreted and applied by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the State of New York against the United States, decided January 6, 1896 (160 U. S. Reports, p. 598), not heretofore allowed or disallowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury, shall be examined, allowed, and paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

On page 87 of said Senate amendment strike out lines numbered 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19.

On page 88 of said Senate amendment, in line numbered 8, strike out the word "thirty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-five."

On page 88 of said Senate amendment, in line numbered 15, strike out the word "thirty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-five."

On page 90 of said Senate amendment strike out lines numbered 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"To James M. Seymour, jr., the sum of \$2,500, for services as assistant commissioner to the International Exposition at Barcelona, Spain."

On page 92 of said Senate amendment, in line numbered 11, strike out "M. M. Deftrees, of Indianapolis, Ind.," and insert in lieu thereof "the State of Indiana."

On page 92 of said Senate amendment, in lines numbered 22, 23, and 24, strike out the words "eight thousand three hundred and five dollars and thirty-eight cents, that being," and insert in lieu thereof the words "five thousand dollars, that being in lieu of."

On page 101 of said Senate amendment strike out lines numbered 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, and on page 102 of said Senate amendment strike out lines numbered 1, 2, and 3.

And the Senate agree to the same.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL, 1902.

Amount of bill as passed by the House..... \$213,165.51
Net increase by the Senate..... 2,929,252.09

Amount of bill passed by the Senate..... 3,142,357.60

Of the increase made by the Senate of \$2,929,252.09, the House has agreed to \$2,451,746.60, and the Senate has receded from \$477,505.49, making the total of the bill, direct appropriation, as agreed to in conference, \$2,664,852.11.

THAD. M. MAHON,
HENRY R. GIBSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
H. M. TELLER,

WM. E. MASON,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The Clerk proceeded to read the statement, as follows:

Statement to accompany conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8587) for the allowance of certain claims—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to know if it is not proper to make the point of order against the report before the statement is read?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can reserve his point of order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I reserve the point of order.

The SPEAKER. Is the point of order against the report or against the statement?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The point of order is against the report.

The SPEAKER. It will have to be made at this time. If the point is well taken, the statement will not be read.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the point of order I have to make against this report of the conferees is that the conferees have proposed amendments that had not been committed to them by either House, and not germane to the subject of difference between the two Houses.

Now, the facts in reference to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, are these: This bill originally passed the House carrying a number of claims known as the Bowman Act claims. It went to the Senate, and the Senate struck out the entire House bill after the enacting clause and added two amendments. The second amendment is immaterial, because it only relates to the title of the bill. So that, as the bill stands before the House, it practically stands as one Senate amendment. In that amendment proposed by the Senate it reinserted the Bowman Act claims as passed by the House, and then, in addition to those claims, a number of other claims, a number of claims providing for the payment of the Selfridge Board findings, a number of claims in reference to the payment of State debts, and a number of private claims.

The House, after considering the bill with the Senate amendments in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, added one amendment to the Senate amendment, and then when the bill came back from the Committee of the Whole into the House the House nonconcurred in all the Senate amendments and sent the bill to conference. After the bill reached the conference there were a number of changes made in the bill, many of them germane to the subject-matter of the differences between the two Houses, but in a comparison of the two bills—that is, the original House bill as it passed the House and the bill known as the Senate amendment as it passed the Senate—I find that the conferees have inserted certain items of appropriation that are neither in the bill as it passed the House nor in the Senate amendment.

In other words, it was not in either document that was sent by either House or Senate to the conferees. But before stating these claims I will say that the conferees have stated in their report what these changes are, but have not stated that they were in neither bill. Therefore I call the attention of the Chair to the fact. One item neither in the House nor Senate bill, as stated in the conference report on page 8 of the Senate amendment, between lines 15 and 16, is the following:

To Charles M. Flower, Frank S. Flower, William Flower, and D. Sprigg Flower, children of Charles H. Flower, deceased, of Rapides Parish, \$23,357.

Again they insert the claim:

To Henry R. Walton, administrator of John Walton, deceased, of Anne Arundel County, \$5,083.

Then they insert:

To John W. Hancock, of Iron County, \$1,160.

I will state that that claim was inserted by the Committee of

the Whole in the House. The other claims were not. Then I also find the claim:

To William B. Horner, late of Shelby County, \$1,250.

That was not considered by either body; and

To Mary E. O. Dashiell, late of Norfolk County, \$810.

So I do not think there is any dispute between us, and I would like the gentleman to correct me if the statement I have made is not correct. I have carefully compared the two bills, and find nowhere in the original bill any of these items. Is not that correct?

Mr. MAHON. The Flower claim and the Walton claim are in the original bill as it passed the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will have to speak louder so that the Chair can hear what he says.

Mr. MAHON. The Flower claim and the Walton claim were in the bill as it passed the House, and were stricken out by the Senate. I will explain that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is no question between us in reference to the fact that there are claims inserted in this bill neither in the House bill as it passed the House nor in the Senate amendment as it passed the Senate, and have been put into the bill by the conferees.

Now, the point that I make is that the only questions that were legitimately before the conferees on this bill were matters that were in dispute between the House and the Senate; that the conferees had no control of and no right to insert matter that was in neither report. Now, I propose, Mr. Speaker, to call the Chair's attention to a ruling of Speaker Carlisle that was made in the Forty-eighth Congress.

The House passed a bill to make appropriations for river and harbor improvements. That bill went to the Senate, and after reaching the Senate all the text of that bill was stricken out except the enacting clause. The Senate then inserted various items of appropriation for river and harbor improvements. The bill came back to the House, was nonconcurred in, and a conference was ordered. The conferees in that instance changed some of the text of the bill. I have been unable to find the original bill and amendments. I therefore can not tell from this decision of Speaker Carlisle whether or not the changes made by the conferees was as to new matter or whether it was not as to new matter and what was germane to the text of the bill. I call the Speaker's attention to this question first before giving the decisions that I rely on to sustain the point of order, because it may seem that the decision of Speaker Carlisle might be against the proposition that I assert. Mr. Carlisle in announcing his decision said:

The House passed a bill to provide for the improvement of rivers and harbors and making an appropriation for that purpose. That bill was sent to the Senate, where it was amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting a different proposition in some respects, but a proposition having the same object in view. When that came back to the House it was treated, and properly so, as one single amendment and not as a series of amendments, as was contended for by some gentlemen on the floor at the time.

It was nonconcurred in by the House and a conference was appointed upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. That conference committee having met, reports back the Senate amendment as a single amendment with various amendments, and recommends that it be concurred in with the other amendments which the committee has incorporated in its report. The question, therefore, is not whether the provisions to which the gentleman from Illinois alludes are germane to the original bill as it passed the House but whether they are germane to the Senate amendment which the House had under consideration and which was referred to the committee of conference. If germane to that amendment, the point of order can not be sustained on the ground claimed by the gentleman from Illinois. The Chair thinks they are germane to the Senate amendment, for though different from the provisions contained in the Senate amendment they relate to the same subject; and therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Now, Mr. Carlisle there determines that these amendments related to the same subject. I do not take it that he meant in rendering that decision that they related to the general scope of the bill, a bill for river and harbor improvement, but that they related to the particular items or subjects in which the amendment was made. For instance, an appropriation for the Tennessee River might be amended and be germane, but a new appropriation for the Tennessee River, not in the Senate amendment, would not have been germane and would not have properly been before the conferees. If Mr. Carlisle decided the question on the other point, that the conferees in a general bill of this class, a bill relating to rivers and harbors, was open to any amendment that the conferees saw fit to insert in the bill, then I say it would be a very dangerous decision. Mr. Speaker, and one that the Chair and the House should not follow. That is the only decision that I can find anywhere that would relate to amendments of this kind being inserted in the bill.

But we have a more recent ruling, a stronger ruling on this proposition, and one that, it seems to me, clearly in point, made by Mr. Blaine when Speaker of this House. I will read to the Chair. It is section 1415 of Hinds's Parliamentary Precedents:

On April 19, 1871, Mr. Henry L. Dawes, of Massachusetts, from the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the Senate to the bill of the House No. 19 (deficiency appropriations), submitted a report thereon in writing.

Mr. William S. Holman, of Indiana, made the point of order that the report contained matter not a subject of difference between the two Houses. Mr. Holman specified that there were incorporated in the report two propositions which were new—a provision making appropriations for the Sutro Tunnel and another for the Agricultural Department. These matters, he submitted, were not referred to the committee of conference at all. He understood that the committee of conference was not authorized to consider matters which had been neither incorporated in Senate amendments nor brought before the House.

The Speaker said:

The rule is as broad as the gentleman from Indiana states it, with this reservation—new propositions may be introduced, but there must be something in the bill to make them germane as amendments. The power of a conference committee which, as gentlemen well know, the two Houses have been in the habit of considerably enlarging fairly includes the power to incorporate germane amendments. If the gentleman from Indiana makes the point that the amendments he specifies are not germane, the Chair will examine the question, but the mere fact that the propositions embrace matters which were not originally before the House or Senate would not be sufficient to require them to be ruled out.

After further debate, during which it was shown that the Sutro-tunnel appropriation was not in the bill when it went to conference, but, as Mr. DAWES stated, was put in to reconcile the Senate conferees to the striking out of an appropriation for the Carson mint, the Speaker said:

The point of order lies against the conference report, but during the experience of the Chair on this floor he has never known a conference report ruled out on a point of order. The report of a conference committee is always received as embodying the conclusions of both Houses, or the representatives of both branches of Congress. The Chair will therefore submit the point of order to the House.

The point of order, being put to the House, was sustained by a vote of 82 ayes to 33 noes.

Now, there is another decision by Speaker Reed which I desire to read, which will be found in paragraph 1417 of Hinds's Parliamentary Precedents:

On June 20, 1898, Mr. JOSEPH W. BABCOCK, of Wisconsin, submitted a conference report on the bill (H. R. 6148) to amend the charter of the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company and the Maryland and Washington Railway, etc.

Mr. WILLIAM P. HEPBURN, of Iowa, made the point of order that the committee of conference had inserted matter over which it had no jurisdiction. A Senate amendment had proposed to extend to other roads a privilege enjoyed by one. The conferees had added an amendment striking out this extension of privilege to others and also taking away the privilege enjoyed by the one.

During the debate it was urged on the one side that the conferees had jurisdiction only on the subject of the disagreeing votes, and that the repeal of this privilege was not in disagreement. On the other hand, it was argued that the Senate had introduced the subject-matter by their amendment, and that it was proper for the conferees to amend it.

The Speaker (Mr. Reed), sustaining the point of order, said:

"If we were to adopt the idea that when once the subject-matter was introduced, that was to control, and not the difference between the two bodies, we should be likely to enlarge the powers of the committee of conference over and beyond what was intended by the House. To the Chair it seems the point of order is well taken, and therefore the Chair sustains it."

Now, Mr. Speaker, whatever may be said of Mr. Carlisle's former ruling in reference to a river and harbor bill—and I do not think that ruling would sustain the insertion of these items in the bill—clearly Mr. Reed's decision, that the only point that should be held in order is the question of differences between the two Houses, is sustained by the logic and reason of the situation. We can find parliamentary decisions on almost every point and looking in every direction; but in order to come to a clear and fair conception of the rule and to render a decision that will fairly guard the interests of the House in this matter, we must consider it from the standpoint of what is intended by the House.

We adopt rules in the House, Mr. Speaker, not to limit the membership of the House in the transaction of public business, but in order to guide and guard the legislation that comes before Congress. We require that all bills and all other matters brought before Congress shall first be carried to a committee and considered there, in order that they may be carefully digested before being brought up in the House. That is the object of having a rule that a point of order can be made against an amendment that is not germane to a matter already considered by the committee. For the same reason the House adopted this rule in reference to conferees. The purpose and object of appointing a conference committee is not that it may report legislation.

There is but one object intended by the House and by the rules in appointing a conference committee, and that is to effect a compromise by which the two Houses may unite in a conclusion which might not be otherwise attained. And when you broaden that rule, when you go outside of that rule, when you extend the powers of the conferees beyond that one proposition, Mr. Speaker, you carry the House into an unknown sea of legislation where we can not be protected in the days at the close of the session when legislation is "rushed," and when we must rely absolutely on the reports of conference committees. The only thing that can safeguard the House is to hold strictly to the rule as Mr. Reid laid it down in the Fifty-fifth Congress—that the conferees must be held to the differences that existed between the two Houses, and not be allowed to enter upon new legislation.

Now, there is no dispute in this case. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself are agreed on the facts. The conferees have taken this bill into conference and inserted matter that was unknown either in the Claims Committee of the House or the

Claims Committee of the Senate—matter reported by neither body and which was never considered by the Senate and House of Representatives.

That being the case, I think the Chair should sustain the point of order, should reject this conference report, and hold the conferees strictly to the points of difference between the two Houses.

It may be argued that this is an omnibus claims bill, and that therefore the conferees can insert new matter. But if the House goes to the point of holding that when you bring in an omnibus bill for the erection of public buildings or for river and harbor improvements or for claims, anything which is germane to the general subject-matter—in a claims bill anything relating to the payment of claims against the Government, or in a river and harbor bill anything relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors, or in an omnibus public-building bill anything that is germane to that general subject—then the House and the committees of the House absolutely lose control of the subject-matter. You make the conferees the legislating committee with all the power of the conference report behind them, giving them special privileges and precedence over everything in the House to put through legislation, and with the temptation to members who have claims already in the bill—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Alabama suspend a moment? The Chair is not clear as to what items the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Pennsylvania are agreed upon as being new items. The Chair did not understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania as referring to the same items which are referred to by the gentleman from Alabama. Are the items numbered in the bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The items are not numbered in the bill; they are specified in the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Can the gentleman give the number of the items in the conference report?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They are not numbered; I shall have to read them by name.

Mr. PAYNE. Has the conference report been printed in the RECORD?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is in the RECORD of the Senate proceedings of May 5.

Mr. PAYNE. What page?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Page 5381.

The first item to which I refer the Chair is—

To John W. Hancock, of Iron County, \$1,160.

This was inserted in the Committee of the Whole when the bill was in the House, but was not put in by the House. The House rejected the entire Senate amendment and nonconcurred in the whole matter, and therefore, although that claim was considered in Committee of the Whole, it was never in difference or dispute between the two Houses.

I refer also to this item:

To William B. Horner, late of Shelby County, \$1,250.

There is no dispute whatever between the gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself as to whether this was in or out. He admits it was never in either bill. Also to Mary E. O. Dashiell, late of Norfolk County, \$810. Some of the other items that I thought were not in the bill the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] claims were in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Then the Chair understands there are two items, that of John W. Hancock, of Iron County, \$1,160, and that of William B. Horner, late of Shelby County, \$1,250.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thought the other items were not in either bill, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] corrects me on that. We both agree on these two items and that the point of order would affect one just as much as the other, so there is no use of discussing the question as to whether the other items are in or out. Now, as I said, the only good reason in the world that we could give to hold that these items are germane—it is not a dispute that they were a difference between the two Houses—would be to hold they are germane to the whole subject-matter of the bill. There is no other item in the bill to which they relate. They did not relate in any way, then, to any other particular item in this bill. The only way that they could be held germane and therefore a subject of conference would be to hold they are germane, because the title of this bill is a general claims bill, and you would therefore be entitled to put in any claims on earth against the Government of the United States.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Suppose the House and Senate adopted this report, after full consideration of both Houses, what fundamental objection is there to that operation? Is not that and would that not be legal legislation?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I do not think it is proper legislation for the House and the Senate to put matters in in conference that have not been considered by both Houses.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Suppose the House and Senate each considered the new items after the conferees had put them in the bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, but that is not the proposition before us.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That is just what we are doing now, as I understand it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Neither the House nor the Senate has considered the proposition.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. We will do that in the House now if given a chance. We can now see whether they are good or bad claims. Certainly the regular practice is better, indeed the safer way.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], in regard to the Hancock claim, that it appeared from the showing here before the Committee of the Whole House that that was a claim that was before the Committee on War Claims and was overlooked and was inserted here by a unanimous vote of the House when that bill was pending before the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman I have stated that fact to the Chair.

Mr. ROBB. That certainly amounts to an instruction to the committee on conference.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not making a point against this particular claim. I do not know but the claim may be a very just one. It is the report that I am making the point of order against. If those claims were legitimately before the House, I would probably vote for both of them. I would not say they are good or bad, but the point that I am making is that they are not properly a subject of conference, and the conferees have exceeded their powers in making this report—that therefore no report has been made to this House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, there is no trouble about this matter. The conferees acted entirely within their scope. In relation to this point of order, the conferees of the House and of the Senate examined the parliamentary law on this subject very carefully, and there is no disposition to put anything into this bill simply because it is a claims bill. The bill was sent from the House to the Senate, and the Senate struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted one amendment, which amendment was in paragraphs. The first 20 pages of that amendment relate entirely to the Bowman Act cases—cases that have been sent from this House to the Court of Claims and have been returned to the Speaker and the President of the Senate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they are claims here on the Calendar of this House. One was for William B. Horner, of \$1,250. He is an old soldier, a man who is now up in the eighties, as I am told. He has fought his claim through the Court of Claims, and has been at it for ten years, and finally got a verdict of \$1,100. The other one returned was the Hancock claim. That is a Bowman Act claim of the same class as was in the Senate amendment for some \$1,100. Now, I am told that he is a very old man. The other is for an old lady. Now, these are the only three matters. There is nothing in this conference report except what was in the House bill as it went to the Senate and in the Senate amendment as it came back to the House.

The SPEAKER. To which bill does the gentleman refer?

Mr. MAHON. To the Hancock and Horner claims.

The SPEAKER. Which was the one that was in the House bill?

Mr. MAHON. Charles Flower in the House bill, and Henry Walton.

The SPEAKER. Was the Hancock bill in the House bill?

Mr. MAHON. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. Was the Horner bill in the House bill?

Mr. MAHON. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. Was the Dashiell bill in the House bill?

Mr. MAHON. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Were they put in in the Senate?

Mr. MAHON. No.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we consulted about this, and out of sympathy for these old people, their claims having come in, and there being only three of them, if they had been younger people probably the conferees would not have put them in. They were added to that part of the amendment that related to the Bowman Act claims from the Court of Claims, and were on that subject alone. Now let me read you a decision of this House:

Although the Senate had amended a bill of the House by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting a different proposition in some respects, yet having the same object in view, the question presented was not whether the provisions excepted to in the conference report were germane to the original House bill, but whether they were germane to the Senate amendments. In the opinion of the Chair, they were clearly germane; for though different from the provisions contained in such amendment, they related directly to the same subjects—

Just as these are Bowman Act cases—

and under the common parliamentary law and practice might be made, by way of amendment, a substantially different proposition from that originally passed by the House.

You will find that in the RECORD of the Forty-ninth Congress, page 7932. So I might quote decision after decision. Now, the conferees had under consideration that part of the amendment in relation to the Bowman Act claims. We struck some out that we thought perhaps ought not to be in, and we inserted these three, exactly on the same subject, in the same part of the amendment, relating to the Bowman Act cases. There is no question but what they are germane to that amendment.

Now, the gentleman talks about appropriating for Tennessee in the river and harbor bill. Of course you could not amend that amendment by putting one in for another State. They are different subjects; but here is the paragraph in this bill relating to the Bowman Act cases, and the conferees after long consideration put them in, not to take any advantage of the House. They were perfectly fair about it, and they put them in simply because they were germane to that amendment, being the same subject-matter, although not in the original bill as it left the House, or in the Senate amendment. I do not think there is any use taking up time. I thought it was understood, or they would not have gone in. We were satisfied they were germane to the paragraph of the bill. All of the decisions are on that line, that where they are not in the House bill and where they are not in the Senate amendment, yet if they are germane and on the same subject under consideration, it has been held that you could put them in, and the Speakers of the House have so decided.

I will not quote the other decisions. They are all in the same line.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit to the consideration of the Chair a precedent that seems to me to be on all fours with the case now before the House. It is found in the Congressional Globe of the Thirty-eighth Congress, on page 1402, and is digested in Hinds's Manual of Parliamentary Precedents, on page 745, section 1420. In that case the House passed the bill. It went to the Senate. The Senate struck out all after the enacting clause and put in a bill of its own. It came back to the House and was nonconcurrent in. Conferees were appointed, and the conferees agreed upon an entirely new bill, containing matter that was not at all contained in the original bill. On it coming again before the House on the report of the conferees, the question of order was raised by Mr. Holman, of Indiana, that the report did not come within the scope of the conference committee, that the conference committee had substituted an entirely new bill, and that so to do was entirely without their jurisdiction. Speaker Colfax on the question of order ruled as follows:

The Chair understands that the Senate adopted a substitute for the House bill. If the two Houses had agreed upon any particular language or any part of a section, the committee of conference could not change that; but the Senate having stricken out the bill of the House and inserted another one—

Which is exactly our case—

the committee of conference have the right to strike out that and report a substitute in its stead. Two separate bills having been referred to the committee, they can take either one of them or a new bill entirely or a bill embracing part of either. They have a right to report any bill that is germane to the bills referred to them.

An appeal was then taken from this decision and it was sustained—yeas 80, nays 35.

I submit to the Chair that that precedent is absolutely conclusive of the question now before the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule on the question, and is impressed with the importance of it. There are but few countries, as the Chair now recalls, that have conference committees in their national legislative bodies, certainly none that have perfected them as we have in the United States. It is one of the vital instrumentalities in bringing the two Houses together and securing joint legislation. But there must be no abuse of that power. It will not do to allow matters not in contemplation by the two Houses, that are foreign to the questions being considered, to be inserted by the conference committee.

The decisions here are conflicting. The one just referred to by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GIBSON], in reference to the Freedmen's Bureau, is "the widest open," so to speak, of the decisions; and yet in that case the new bill treated of the subject-matter of the original propositions, which was how to handle the interests of the freedmen, and one can readily see that the Chair might allow that to come in without being a violation of the rule.

Now, what are the facts in this particular case? We have incorporated here, according to the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in charge of the bill, three entirely new items, not known to the action of the House, not considered in the action of the Senate. One is the Hancock item, which we find was known as Senate bill 52, and in the House as House bill 11208; another is the Horner item, known as H. R. 12590, and the other the Dashiell item, known as H. R. 13223, entirely separate and distinct bills, presenting different rights and different questions for the consideration of the Congress. Now, the

gentleman from Pennsylvania, in his ingenious argument, seeks to avoid the force of the objection made by the gentleman from Alabama because they were claims. But there are different claims. The House might be well pleased to insert and allow one claim and wholly opposed to another claim, and for the conference committee to step into outside matters, not before it by the action of the two Houses, and bring in a new claim that had never been considered by either House on the ground of its being germane, it seems to the Chair would open a very dangerous pathway to unwise legislation.

Now, while the Chair believes that the conference committee is a great instrumentality to bring the two Houses together, still the Chair would be very loath to open the door to allow any conference committee to usurp the prerogatives of either House; and while he has examined with care the several decisions, the weight of authority is in the line of his own feelings on this question; and even when submitted to a vote of the House, as was done in one case, the House sustained the views of the objecting party, Judge Holman.

The Chair is strongly of the opinion that to secure wise legislation caution should be observed in not allowing abuse of the powers of the conference committee, and this view invites sustaining the point of order in this case. The functions of a conference committee are such that they must consider a matter laid before them by the Congress. If it involves an amount of money they may increase it or cut it down; they may put limitations upon it. The functions of a conference committee are great and can be of infinite benefit to the House of Representatives. The feeling of the Chair is, then, that the door should not be opened beyond the scope and purpose of a conference committee. That is clear; and the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Alabama. Therefore that brings us to the next thing for consideration.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Let the Chair conclude.

Where does this leave this conference report? It has to be treated as a whole. The point of order defeats the conference report just exactly as if it were rejected by the House. That has already been held in one case—I think by Mr. Speaker Reed—that a point of order sustained against a conference report is equivalent to a rejection of the report by the House of Representatives on a vote. And it seems to the Chair that is where this conference report now stands.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to the Speaker, I do not feel disposed to let this matter rest with the judgment of one man in the House. I am well satisfied that these matters are germane, and therefore I most respectfully appeal from the decision of the Speaker.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move to lay that appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania appeals from the decision of the Chair, and the gentleman from Alabama moves to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. MAHON. In due time I will make another motion, Mr. Speaker. I will withdraw the appeal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraws his appeal.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend for a moment? [After a pause.] The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for another conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to further insist and ask for a conference. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman, if I may, touching the provision of the conference report which has been rejected, and is supposed germane to the Senate amendment, touching the Nevada claims, so called. I have just returned after an absence of some ten days, and this morning for the first time saw what was proposed. I have given it a hasty reading, and, in my judgment, in light of legislation that was had upon the urgent deficiency bill, I am inclined to think that legislation along the line of establishing an absolutely unfair precedent. It is the legality of the so-called Nevada claim, and any precedent would open the door for many hundreds of millions of dollars of claims for the various States, for bounties, extra pay, etc., paid by the States.

Now, I hope it shall not be necessary when this report comes back to antagonize the conference report. It is a question on which, as one member of the House, I am not in favor of—any legislation that would commit the United States where it is not now committed. We have had legislation to remove the statute of limitation, which we have done at this session of Congress, and I ask the gentleman if it will be necessary to offer a resolution of instructions to the committee.

Mr. MAHON. Let me explain to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. There was only this Territory of Nevada. This money was expended for sending troops to the front, just the same as was done in Illinois, Ohio, and all the other States. Now, New York made an effort, and succeeded in establishing the proposition, that under the act of 1861, where the Secretary of War authorized the borrowing of money to put troops into the field, and they issued their bonds for the same, that the interest of those bonds was to be an obligation against the Government.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. MAHON. So that Pennsylvania secured hers, and in the last urgent deficiency bill a section was included for the benefit of the other States, and under this general section their claims are referred to the Secretary of War, there to be adjudicated under the principle laid down by the United States Supreme Court in the case of New York against the United States.

Now, if Nevada had been a State at the time this money was expended, she would not need this legislation; but she was at that time a Territory. The clause that the gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the Appropriation Committee, put in would cover the State of Nevada exactly, but she was not, as I say, a State. She was brought into the Union a short time after the money had been expended and her troops put into the field. Under the call of 1861 she issued \$100,000 worth of bonds and sent 1,180 men into the Army of the United States, exactly as did other States, although she was then a Territory. These bonds are still unpaid. Although under the law of 1861 the States were paid the principal or face of the bond, Nevada was not paid because the act did not include Territories.

Nevada asked for a direct appropriation of \$424,000. We did not know what it was for, but if she borrowed that money, having issued her bonds under the call of the Secretary of War, then she ought to be treated the same as any other State although a Territory. As I say, if Nevada had been a State at the time she issued the bonds she would be covered by the clause in the urgent deficiency bill. This section is simply drawn to put the Territory of Nevada on all fours with the other States of this Union. This does not establish a precedent; it does not effect any other State. It puts Nevada on the same footing as any other State in the Union.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Do the States get payment without being obliged to sue in the Court of Claims?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. The State of Nevada was brought into the Union after the war; brought in for a purpose, so that we might have sufficient votes to adopt amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I have the act of 1861 and 1862, and I also have before me the legislation of this session of Congress, which seems to me is pretty broad:

And the claims of like character arising under the act of Congress of July 27, 1861 (12 Stat., p. 276), and joint resolution of March 8, 1862 (12 Stat., p. 615), as interpreted and applied by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of State of New York v. The United States, decided January 6, 1896 (160 U. S. Rep., p. 598), not heretofore allowed, or heretofore disallowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury, shall be reopened, examined, and allowed, and if deemed necessary shall be transmitted to the Court of Claims for findings of fact or determination of disputed questions of law, to aid in the settlement of claims by the accounting officers.

Now, then, I understand the gentleman to say that Nevada at the time of this expenditure was a Territory.

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. And that therefore the acts of 1861 and 1862 did not apply to the Territory of Nevada; that the object of the clause in the conference report which has gone out on a point of order was to place the present State of Nevada exactly in the same condition that New York and other States are in under the act of 1861 and the joint resolution of 1862, and to pay that State for expenditures made by the Territory precisely for the same class of claims, and no other, that the other States are entitled to payment for. I understand that to be the position of the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. Now, will the gentleman from Illinois permit me to read the amendment in full? It is as follows:

That the claim of the State of Nevada for costs, charges, and expenses incurred by the Territory of Nevada for enrolling, subsisting, clothing, supplying, arming, equipping, paying, and transporting its troops employed in aiding to suppress the insurrection against the United States, war of 1861-1865, under the act of Congress of July 27, 1861 (12 Stat., p. 276), and joint resolution of March 8, 1862 (12 Stat., p. 615), as interpreted and applied by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the State of New York against the United States, decided January 6, 1896 (160 U. S. Reports, p. 598), not heretofore allowed or disallowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury, shall be examined, allowed, and paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Now, that exactly follows the clause in the urgent deficiency bill except the concluding part.

Mr. CANNON. No; the gentleman has got something in there that is not in the report.

Mr. MAHON. I quoted it exactly from the urgent deficiency bill except the concluding part.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman puts in something that is not in the act, namely: The act that applied to the other States reads as follows:

Shall be reopened, examined, and allowed, and if deemed necessary shall be transmitted to the Court of Claims for findings of fact or determinations of disputed questions of law to aid in the settlement of the claims by the accounting officers.

Now, then, by the clause in the urgent deficiency bill which I have just read Congress keeps the whip hand. The accounting officers are only authorized to adjust the accounts of the States in the light of the New York decision, and they must certify to Congress for its information.

Now, the gentleman leaves out the Court of Claims, and in addition to that the gentleman proceeds "and paid out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated." In other words, Congress loses the whip hand. I want to say to the gentleman that I fear, in the light of the act of 1882 that was passed touching Nevada, Texas, Kansas, and some other States, under which there was an adjudication and payment to Nevada, as well as to the other States, I am fearful, in the light of that subsequent decision, from a hasty examination, that this legislation may give, by legislative construction, something to Nevada that has been denied to the other States.

Illinois, New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and other States, many of them, if not all, paid from \$100 to \$500 bounty. Massachusetts gave as extra pay to all her soldiers in the war of the rebellion almost as much as they received from the Federal Government. Now, those bounties and that extra pay have never been reimbursed by the United States. In the light of what has passed, I am afraid the gentleman from Pennsylvania has got this provision broad enough to repay to the State of Nevada the extra pay which she paid—

Mr. MAHON. Did your State as a State pay bounties, or were the bounties paid by the municipalities?

Mr. CANNON. I think the bounties were paid by the State; but I am not sure about that.

Mr. MAHON. Your State paid \$50 bounty.

Mr. CANNON. Now, if the Territory of Nevada was not covered by the act of 1861-62, I am perfectly willing that there should be legislation so covering it, although I believe that the State of Nevada, under an adjudication which has been made, has already been paid all that she is entitled to, unless she is entitled to something for interest.

Now, if the gentleman has the same object in view that I have, there can be no dispute between us.

Mr. MAHON. Certainly not.

Mr. CANNON. But I fear that the provision of this conference report may do something which on fuller examination will prove to be what the gentleman is not designing to do.

Mr. MAHON. Let me say to the gentleman that under that amendment the State of Nevada can not get a dollar beyond what was allowed to the State of New York by the decision which has been referred to. If Nevada did not make expenditures of the kind referred to in the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, she gets nothing.

Mr. CANNON. Under the act of 1861-62?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. There has never been a case in the history of this Government where the Government ever appealed from the decision of an accounting officer. I do not think the gentleman can cite such a case.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, there have been a great many cases where the action of the accounting officer has been absolutely repudiated.

Mr. MAHON. I believe in every such case it was the State that made the appeal. It was with the view of protecting the Government that this provision was framed as it is.

Mr. CANNON. I want to put the State of Nevada on all fours with the State of New York under the legislation of 1861-62 and under the decision of the case of New York v. The United States. If Nevada is not on all fours with New York, I am willing and desirous of putting her in that position; but there I want to stop.

Mr. MAHON. Well, we shall have no trouble about that matter.

Mr. CANNON. I am perfectly willing to treat the Territory of Nevada in the same manner as if she had been a State.

My eye has just fallen upon the provision in reference to this matter. When this conference meets again from time to time members of the House may desire to present something for the gentleman's consideration or for the consideration of the committee; and I am perfectly willing not to embarrass him, because from what he says—and I have always found him a man of his word—there appears to be no difference between him and myself as to what is desirable in this legislation.

Mr. MAHON. The only question is as to the shape in which the provision shall be put.

Mr. NEWLANDS. As I understand the gentleman from Illi-

nois, he is willing to waive the statute of limitations in regard to any claim that the State of Nevada may have.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. NEWLANDS. And he is willing also that the Territory of Nevada (now a State) shall be put on an equality with the various States that made these advances.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Now, I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the language in this report exactly tallies with the act of 1861, which provided—

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay to the governor of any State, or to his duly authorized agents, the costs, charges, and expenses properly incurred by such State for enrolling, subsisting, clothing, supplying, arming, equipping, paying, and transporting its troops employed in aiding to suppress the present insurrection against the United States, to be settled upon proper vouchers, to be filed and passed upon by the proper accounting officers of the Treasury.

I repeat that this conference report simply follows the language of the original act; it prescribes the same method of procedure in the presentation of claims, it follows the same method of accounting, it follows the same form of appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. Does my friend construe that as to Nevada this money was payable in gold, and that in making reimbursement now we would have to make up for the difference between gold and greenbacks.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I have no construction in regard to that. I simply say that the provision embraced in the conference report renews the act of 1861-62, and makes it operative as to the State of Nevada (then a Territory) as it has been with reference to all the other States.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me a suggestion at this point? In point of fact, the State of Nevada on its own motion paid its own troops twice what the troops of the State of New York were paid by the United States. Now, the United States, in settling with the States for claims of this kind, has paid only the same sums that were paid by the United States to other soldiers. The Government has not paid any of the bounties that various States paid to their troops, and it is the settled construction under the act that no such payments are due from the United States. I take it, then, that my friend does not desire that Nevada under this legislation should receive the difference between greenbacks and gold or should receive pay to the extent of double the amount that the United States paid its own soldiers. If so, my friend and myself do not agree about it, and I am merely talking about it so that if we can now by this discussion and comparison of notes in the House indicate the principles upon which this matter should be settled, it would save us perhaps great trouble when the conference report comes in for adoption.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois that I am not authorized to waive any part of the claim of the State of Nevada. I presume if this becomes law it will go before the accounting officers of the Treasury and will be determined by them just as the claims of other States have been. I believe that entire claim to be a just claim, and I am willing to meet the gentleman or anyone who opposes it at the proper time on the floor of this House in debate. I do not think this is, however, the time to go into all the intricacies of these claims unless the gentleman wishes to force the discussion now.

Mr. CANNON. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he is willing to take the substance of that provision in the urgent deficiency bill that applies to all the other States and make it apply to the State of Nevada?

Mr. MAHON. The only change we would have to make would be to put in what is stricken out of that section in the urgent deficiency bill. We followed it except that we struck that out. If the gentleman examines the amendment, he will find that we followed it exactly.

Mr. CANNON. He is willing to take that modification?

Mr. MAHON. Oh, yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to further insist on disagreements to the amendment of the Senate and ask for a conference.

Mr. ROBB rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MAHON. No; I can not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. UNDERWOOD) there were—ayes 100, noes 19.

The SPEAKER. The motion prevails, and the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. MAHON, GIBSON, and SIMS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask recognition to move instructions to the conferees.

The SPEAKER. That would be in order before the appointment of the conferees and after the conference had been ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, the conference has been ordered. The SPEAKER. If the gentleman states that he was rising to get the attention of the Chair, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I was; I desired to move instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send up his instructions.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the Clerk to take it down. I desire to move that the conference be instructed not to agree to what is known as the Selfridge board findings in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the conferees be instructed not to agree to what is known as the Selfridge board findings in the Senate amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to occupy any great space of time, but I just wish a few words.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MAHON. I make the point of order that this is not in order after the conferees have been appointed.

The SPEAKER. That part of the statement of the Chair was withdrawn on the statement that the gentleman was trying to get recognition. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed the merits and demerits of the Selfridge board findings over a week ago. It has been printed in the RECORD. I do not know that I can throw any more new light on the proposition by going into a further discussion of the question, but I wish to say this, that when we had this bill in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, considering this question of the Selfridge board findings, the House debated the question. It was considered and voted on, and by a vote on the floor of this House the House rejected the Selfridge board findings by a majority of the House. That was virtually an instruction to the conferees of the House not to agree to the Senate amendment in that particular. It may not have been a direct instruction, but it certainly amounted to an instruction.

Now, with that situation staring the conferees in the face, a majority of the conferees—Mr. SIMS did not sign the report—did go into conference with the Senate; did at once agree to accept the entire Senate bill, rejecting the virtual instructions of the House, bringing back this bill before the House on a unanimous conference report, where, if it had not been knocked out by a point of order, it would have been impossible for this House to take up the bill item by item and give it consideration. We have been required to vote for the bill as a whole under the report brought in here by the conference committee. Notwithstanding the fact that the House had rejected these claims, the conference committee brought them back into this House under the report just rejected on a point of order without giving the House any opportunity whatever for a separate vote in the matter. Now, I say that under those circumstances the House is justified and ought to adopt instructions directing these conferees not to agree to those Selfridge board findings. Let them come in and stand up before the Senate conferees and tell the Senate that the House is not willing to pass that portion of the bill, and then if they find they can not get the Senate to recede they can properly come back here and report the facts to the House, where we will have an opportunity to further consider these claims on their merits without being tied up with the other claims in the bill, and give them a separate consideration.

Now, I am not going into a full discussion of the merits or demerits of the Selfridge board claims. I do not think they ought to be paid. There is no justification for them. They claim that the plans were changed, and therefore that the contractors lost money. The record does not sustain them. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury at the time and the report of Senator Grimes, chairman of the Committee on Claims of the Senate at the time, both state that there had been no change whatever in the plans and that it was merely an appeal to the generosity of Congress to pay these claims. They have been rejected for forty years, and now they come here asking you to give them between a million and a million and a half of dollars to pay claims that at the time when they were new and people understood the facts had been thoroughly digested and rejected. I therefore think that under these circumstances the House is justified in instructing the conferees, and ought to instruct the conferees in this case not to agree to these claims.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make any reply. This matter has been discussed over and over in this House. The Senate conferees state that they will not recede under any consideration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama to instruct the conferees. As many as favor the motion will say "aye;" those opposed, "no."

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes 67, noes 64.

Mr. ROBERTS. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moves that the conferees be instructed not to agree to what are known as the Selfridge claims on this bill, and on that motion the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 112, nays 71, answered "present" 20, not voting 148, as follows:

YEAS—112.

Allen, Ky.	Foster, Ill.	Lewis, Pa.	Reid,
Ball, Tex.	Fox,	Little,	Rhea, Va.
Bartlett,	Gill,	Lloyd,	Richardson, Ala.
Bellamy,	Glenn,	McCulloch,	Richardson, Tenn.
Bowersock,	Gooch,	McLain,	Rixey,
Brantley,	Gordon,	Mahoney,	Robinson, Ind.
Breazeale,	Green, Pa.	Mann,	Robinson, Nebr.
Bristow,	Griffith,	Martin,	Rucker,
Brundidge,	Hay,	Mercer,	Scott,
Burkett,	Hemenway,	Mickey,	Selby,
Butler, Mo.	Henry, Conn.	Miers, Ind.	Shallenberger,
Caldwell,	Hepburn,	Miller,	Shattuc,
Cannon,	Holliday,	Morgan,	Sims,
Clark,	Hooker,	Morris,	Small,
Clayton,	Johnson,	Needham,	Smith, Ill.
Cooney,	Jones, Va.	Olmsted,	Smith, Ky.
Cromer,	Jones, Wash.	Overstreet,	Smith, Samuel W.
Crumpacker,	Kern,	Padgett,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Cushman,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Palmer,	Snodgrass,
Darragh,	Kleberg,	Parker,	Spight,
Davey, La.	Kluttz,	Pou,	Stephens, Tex.
De Armond,	Lacey,	Powers, Me.	Stevens, Minn.
Dougherty,	Landis,	Prince,	Tongue,
Douglas,	Lanham,	Pugsley,	Underwood,
Driscoll,	Lawrence,	Ransdell, La.	Weeks,
Edwards,	Lester,	Ray, N. Y.	Williams, Ill.
Elliott,	Lever,	Reeder,	Williams, Miss.
Flood,	Lewis, Ga.	Reeves,	Wooten.

NAYS—71.

Acheson,	Currier,	Joy,	Powers, Mass.
Alexander,	Dalzell,	Ketcham,	Roberts,
Allen, Me.	Davis, Fla.	Lamb,	Ruppert,
Ball, Del.	Dick,	Lesser,	Russell,
Beidler,	Evans,	Lindsay,	Ryan,
Blackburn,	Fitzgerald,	Littlefield,	Sherman,
Blakeney,	Fordney,	Long,	Sibley,
Brownlow,	Gaines, Tenn.	Loudenslager,	Smith, Iowa
Bull,	Gibson,	McLachlan,	Sparkman,
Burke, S. Dak.	Gillet, N. Y.	Mahon,	Sperry,
Butler, Pa.	Goldfogle,	Mondell,	Stewart, N. Y.
Capron,	Graff,	Moody, N. C.	Sulzer,
Cassel,	Graham,	Moon,	Taylor, Ohio
Connell,	Grosvenor,	Mudd,	Tirrell,
Conry,	Hamilton,	Newlands,	Tompkins, Ohio
Coombs,	Haskins,	Otjen,	Vreeland,
Cooper, Wis.	Haugen,	Patterson, Tenn.	Woods.
Creamer,	Hildebrandt,	Pearre,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—20.

Barney,	Deemer,	Maynard,	Tate,
Boutell,	Grow,	Metcalf,	Trimble,
Burnett,	Irwin,	Meyer, La.	Wanger,
Corliss,	Jackson, Kans.	Showalter,	Wheeler,
Cowherd,	McClellan,	Southard,	Young.

NOT VOTING—148.

Adams,	Dovener,	Kahn,	Schirm,
Adamson,	Draper,	Kehoe,	Shackelford,
Aplin,	Eddy,	Kitchin, Claude	Shafroth,
Babcock,	Emerson,	Knapp,	Shelden,
Bankhead,	Esch,	Knox,	Sheppard,
Bartholdt,	Feely,	Kyle,	Skiles,
Bates,	Finley,	Lassiter,	Slayden,
Bell,	Fleming,	Latimer,	Smith, Henry C.
Belmont,	Fletcher,	Littaner,	Snook,
Benton,	Foerderer,	Livingston,	Southwick,
Bingham,	Foss,	Loud,	Stark,
Bishop,	Foster, Vt.	Lovering,	Steele,
Boreing,	Fowler,	McAndrews,	Stewart, N. J.
Bowie,	Gaines, W. Va.	McCall,	Storm,
Brick,	Gardner, Mich.	McCleary,	Sulloway,
Bromwell,	Gardner, N. J.	McDermott,	Sutherland,
Broussard,	Gilbert,	McRae,	Swanson,
Brown,	Gillett, Mass.	Maddox,	Talbert,
Burgess,	Greene, Mass.	Marshall,	Tawney,
Burk, Pa.	Griggs,	Minor,	Taylor, Ala.
Burleigh,	Hall,	Moody, Oreg.	Thayer,
Burleson,	Hanbury,	Morreil,	Thomas, Iowa
Burton,	Heatwole,	Moss,	Thomas, N. C.
Calderhead,	Hedge,	Mutchler,	Tompson,
Candler,	Henry, Miss.	Naphen,	Tompkins, N. Y.
Cassingham,	Henry, Tex.	Neville,	Vandiver,
Cochran,	Hill,	Nevin,	Van Voorhis,
Conner,	Hitt,	Norton,	Wachter,
Cooper, Tex.	Hopkins,	Patterson, Pa.	Wadsworth,
Cousins,	Howard,	Payne,	Warner,
Crowley,	Howell,	Perkins,	Warnock,
Curtis,	Hughes,	Pierce,	Watson,
Dahle,	Hull,	Randell, Tex.	White,
Davidson,	Jack,	Robb,	Wiley,
Dayton,	Jackson, Md.	Robertson, La.	Wilson,
De Graffenreid,	Jenkins,	Rumple,	Wright,
Dinsmore,	Jett,	Scarborough,	Zenor.

So the instructions to the committee of conference were agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

Mr. JACK with Mr. FINLEY.

Mr. IRWIN with Mr. GOOCH.

Mr. DRAPER with Mr. MADDOX.

Mr. BARNEY with Mr. McRAE.

Mr. SOUTHERD with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. SUTHERLAND with Mr. JACKSON of Kansas.

Mr. TAWNEY with Mr. COWHERD.

Mr. EMERSON with Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. STEELE with Mr. COOPER of Texas.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts with Mr. NAPHEN.

Mr. SHOWALTER with Mr. SLAYDEN.

Mr. THOMAS of Iowa with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. BOUTELL with Mr. GRIGGS.

Mr. SKILES with Mr. TALBERT.

For this session:

Mr. YOUNG with Mr. BENTON.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. BELMONT.

Mr. BROMWELL with Mr. CASSINGHAM.

Mr. MORRELL with Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DEEMER with Mr. MUTCHLER.

Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. HALL.

Mr. BOREING with Mr. TRIMBLE.

Mr. DAYTON with Mr. MEYER of Louisiana.

Mr. HEATWOLE with Mr. TATE.

Mr. METCALF with Mr. WHEELER.

Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON.

For this day:

Mr. HITT with Mr. DINSMORE.

Mr. SULLOWAY with Mr. KEHOE.

Mr. JENKINS with Mr. HENRY of Mississippi.

Mr. McCLEARY with Mr. McANDREWS.

Mr. RUMPLE with Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. HOWELL with Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN.

Mr. DOVENER with Mr. STARK.

Mr. SHELDEN with Mr. CROWLEY.

Mr. WACHTER with Mr. BURNETT.

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. BELL.

Mr. FOSS with Mr. BOWIE.

Mr. McCALL with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. WARNOCK with Mr. SHACKLEFORD.

Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. BISHOP with Mr. BURGESS.

Mr. BRICK with Mr. BURLESON.

Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania with Mr. COCHRAN.

Mr. WARNER with Mr. CANDLER.

Mr. BURLEIGH with Mr. DE GRAFFENREID.

Mr. CALDERHEAD with Mr. FEELY.

Mr. CONNER with Mr. FLEMING.

Mr. COUSINS with Mr. HENRY of Texas.

Mr. CURTIS with Mr. JETT.

Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. LASSITER.

Mr. ESCH with Mr. LATIMER.

Mr. FLETCHER with Mr. McDERMOTT.

Mr. FOERDERER with Mr. NEVILLE.

Mr. HANBURY with Mr. RANDELL of Texas.

Mr. HEDGE with Mr. WILSON.

Mr. MINOR with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. HILL with Mr. ROBB.

Mr. HUGHES with Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

Mr. HULL with Mr. SHAFROTH.

Mr. KNOX with Mr. SNOOK.

Mr. LITTAUER with Mr. THAYER.

Mr. SCHIRM with Mr. ZENOR.

Mr. LOVERING with Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina.

Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. VANDIVER.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. SHEPPARD.

Mr. WADSWORTH with Mr. WHITE.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey with Mr. WILEY.

On this vote:

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. MAYNARD.

Mr. BURTON with Mr. McCLELLAN.

Mr. MOODY of Oregon with Mr. PIERCE.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Speaker, I forgot for a moment that I was paired with the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. TAWNEY. I voted "yea." I desire to be recorded as "present."

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the following conferees on the bill: Mr. MAHON, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. SIMS.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for

the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, and pending that motion, I ask my colleague if he has any suggestion to make in reference to the limitation of time for general debate.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. There are a number of gentlemen on this side who desire to speak, and I suggest six hours on a side for general debate.

Mr. FOSS. I will say to my friend I can not use one-third of that on this side, so far as I have been able to hear from members on this side of the House, and I would suggest to him that we do not fix any limitation for the present, but go into Committee of the Whole and have general debate for the rest of the afternoon, he to control one half of the time and the chairman of the committee to control the other half.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, asks that this day be devoted to general debate, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER] to control one half of the time and he the other half, this not to be understood as limiting general debate. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion of the gentleman, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House bill 14046, the naval appropriation bill.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 14046, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14046) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor, on behalf of the Committee on Naval Affairs, to report and call up at this time for the consideration of the committee this bill, known as the naval appropriation bill, which makes appropriation for the maintenance of the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903. I have set forth in the report, which is available to all members of the House, an exhaustive statement as to every item appropriated in this bill, to which I will ask members of the House to make reference; and if there are any questions which any member desires to ask me in reference to the bill, either now or in the course of general debate, I will be most happy to answer them, provided they are not too difficult. But there are some general matters included in this bill which I think it wise at this time to call to the attention of the House.

In the first place, let us consider the size of the bill. The amount carried by this bill is \$77,659,386.63. This is a decrease from the bill of last year to the amount of \$442,404.77. Now, the Committee on Naval Affairs have had under consideration for a number of months in the committee room the preparation of this bill. They have been diligently at work laboring in a measure to cut down the appropriations, providing for the economical administration of the naval establishment.

Our estimates were unusual this year. The original estimates sent here by the Navy Department at the beginning of Congress amounted to \$98,000,000. To this afterwards came supplemental estimates of a million and one-half dollars, and then additional estimates from time to time from the Secretary of the Navy amounting to five million more. So that the total estimates for the naval establishment this year coming from the Department through the regular channels to the Committee on Naval Affairs, all told, original, supplemental, and additional, amounted in all to \$103,000,000.

These estimates the committee have cut down to the extent of \$27,405,298. I may say that that fact alone is worth commenting upon, entailing, as it did, laborious consideration and the careful investigation which has been given to the subject of naval affairs in the committee room.

Now, these reductions in the estimates were principally from public works. The estimates under the Bureau of Yards and Docks for public works called for \$20,781,375, but the committee thought it wise to reduce this and recommended appropriations to the amount of \$6,561,075, showing a decrease under the head of "Public works" in the Bureau of Yards and Docks of \$14,220,000. Under the Bureau of Ordnance there was a decrease of \$333,000. Under "Public works," for the Naval Academy, a decrease of \$1,000,000; under "Public works," Bureau of Ordnance, \$1,065,000; under the Bureau of Equipment, \$1,870,000; under the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts a decrease of \$570,000; under the Bureau

of Construction and Repair, \$1,340,000; under the Bureau of Steam Engineering, \$300,000; under the head of "Increase of Navy," \$1,000,000. The balance of deductions is made up from reductions from supplemental and additional estimates.

The next question I wish to call to the attention of members of the committee is this: We have made provision here for more men. As everyone will see, when we are building ships it is necessary also to make provision for additional men. This matter was called to the attention of the committee by the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation and by the Secretary in his annual report. Both the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation and the Secretary of the Navy joined in the recommendation for 3,000 additional men, and this recommendation is made by your committee. It will be necessary, as we go on building ships, to provide, from time to time, of course, for an increased number of men and also an increased number of officers. The two go hand in hand together, and it is necessary to provide for more men in advance of the construction of ships because it takes two and three years to properly train the men so that they can successfully man the ships. Take, for instance, the ships now under construction, and it will require about 14,000 additional men to properly man them. Of this number we have already provided in the last appropriation bill for 5,000 men and this year for 3,000 more, and it will be necessary to provide for 6,000 more before the time of the completion of the ships.

Now, there is another phase of this bill which I desire to call attention of the members to, and that is the necessity for more officers. The Chief of the Bureau of Navigation in his report sets out that it will be necessary by the time the present ships now in process of construction are completed to have at least a thousand men to successfully officer them. Now, when the committee started in on the consideration of this question, they called upon the Department to furnish an itemized list of the number of officers needed for each ship, and that list or statement you will find in the report on page 14, giving the names of the ship and the number of officers for each ship.

The committee also, at the same time, called on the Department for a statement as to what our officers were doing at the present time, whether on sea or shore duty, and you will find the statement upon page 15 of the report to this effect: The total number of line officers to-day in the Navy is 1,017, including 124 cadets now at sea, and who have not as yet received their commissions. Of this number there are 993 eligible for sea duty. Of this number 709 are performing duty on vessels or are beyond the seas, 272 performing duty on shore. Now, it will be seen that there are comparatively few officers to officer our ships which are now in process of building.

And if we are to have the officers ready when the ships are completed, it is necessary for us now to make provision for more officers. Why? Because it takes four years—yes, six years—to train officers. They must have an education at the Naval Academy, which requires four years, and then two years of sea service before receiving their commissions. So in this bill the committee have recommended a provision for an increase of officers to the extent of 500—a temporary provision, because it operates only for the coming four years. It is believed that when the present law, which was modified a year or so ago, by which every member of the House appoints a cadet once in four years instead of once in six years, has had time to operate, that law will provide for the officers needed for our growing Navy.

Now, as I say, this bill provides for the appointment of 500 additional cadets, covering a period of four years. The first year the Senators are to make appointments, one each. The President is given the appointment of 6 cadets a year, or 24 cadets covering the four years; and then during the succeeding three years each member of the House will have an additional appointment. In that way we make up the number of 500 additional cadets.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. At what date will a member have the right to make an appointment?

Mr. FOSS. That will be determined by the Navy Department—probably by lot.

Mr. METCALF. Can the gentleman tell us how many officers are stationed at the private shipbuilding yards of the country?

Mr. FOSS. At present?

Mr. METCALF. Yes, sir.

Mr. FOSS. No; I do not know.

Mr. LANDIS. After these cadets appointed in this manner go out, is provision made for appointments to keep up the number?

Mr. FOSS. Well, this provision, as I say, is temporary and ceases to operate at the end of four years. The present law operates continuously—during the coming four years and after that.

Mr. LANDIS. And unless some additional legislation—

Mr. FOSS. Unless some additional legislation is had, that will be the only law in existence to give us more officers after the expiration of this temporary provision. But the committee believe,

or rather hope, that the present law will be sufficient to produce enough officers for the increasing Navy.

Mr. LANDIS. Then, after the expiration of this temporary provision, things will drop back to the normal condition?

Mr. FOSS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. What provision is there in the bill for the construction of new ships at Government navy-yards?

Mr. FOSS. I will say to my friend that I shall reach that question in a moment or two.

Now, I have touched upon the question of more men and more officers, and have pointed out the recommendations of the committee in these respects. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH] calls my attention to the ships. We have provided in this bill for the increase of the Navy by the construction of 2 battle ships, 2 armored cruisers, and 2 gunboats. We are to-day building 8 battle ships. We have more than half of them completed. We are building 6 armored cruisers, about one-fourth of which are completed. We are building 9 protected cruisers, 5 of which are more than half completed. We have 9 torpedo boats nearly completed and 7 submarines nearly finished.

I might say that the committee have recommended the building of 2 battle ships and 2 armored cruisers in the line of what might be called a suggestion from Congress last year. It will be remembered that in the last naval appropriation bill Congress enacted a provision calling upon the Secretary of the Navy to report upon the cost of 2 battle ships and 2 armored cruisers. I will not read the provision, but the Secretary of the Navy was called upon to submit a report upon the whole subject, which he has already done and which any member can refer to if he desires.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How much are they to cost?

Mr. FOSS. The cost of these ships, in accordance with plans recommended by the Board of Construction, amounts in all to about \$30,000,000. The battle ships, which will be ships of 16,000 tons each—the largest battle ships of any that we have—will cost \$7,532,000 apiece.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How does that compare with the cost of constructing such vessels heretofore?

Mr. FOSS. Our battle ships heretofore have cost anywhere from \$6,000,000 to six and a half million dollars.

A MEMBER. Inclusive of ordnance?

Mr. FOSS. Inclusive of everything; that is the completed cost.

Now, the armored cruisers will cost \$6,700,000 apiece, and the gunboats \$510,000 apiece, making in all a total cost for 2 first-class battle ships, 2 armored cruisers, and 2 gunboats approximately \$29,500,000.

Now, there are several boards in the Navy Department whose business it is to recommend naval programmes. One is the general board. They have recommended the building of something like 35 ships. Then there is the Board of Construction, which recommended to the Secretary of the Navy the building of about 40 ships. And the Secretary of the Navy made a recommendation, I think, calling for 22 ships in number. I have not counted them up. He asked for 3 first-class battle ships, 2 first-class armored cruisers, 3 gunboats of 6,000 tons displacement, 3 gunboats of 2,000 tons displacement, 3 picket boats of 600 tons displacement, 3 steel training ships of about 2,000 tons displacement, 1 collier of 15,000 tons, and 4 tugboats, and while the recommendations of the different boards have been had, yet it must be remembered, of course, that the men who recommend them are naval officers ambitious for the profession in which they are engaged and are desirous of seeing our Navy built up as fast and speedily as possible; but this committee—and I refer to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union—composed of the representatives of the American people, have to decide for the people themselves as to how far and how fast we shall pursue the policy of building up the American Navy.

Now, in view of the fact that Congress intimated in the appropriation bill of last year that it was its wish that the Secretary of the Navy should report only upon two battle ships and two armored cruisers, the Committee on Naval Affairs did not think it wise to make any further recommendation, and that is the reason why we come here with a programme to-day of two battle ships and two armored cruisers and two gunboats, in all, a total tonnage of 63,000 tons, requiring an appropriation of \$30,000,000, not in this bill, but in subsequent bills, to construct them, because we believe that we are carrying out the intimation and suggestion of Congress in the appropriation bill of last year. Now, we have had greater programmes than this in years past. Under the naval appropriation bill of March 3, 1899, we provided for a total tonnage that year of ships to the amount of 104,000 tons, and under the appropriation bill passed June 7, 1900, we made the further increase in ships to the amount of 99,920 tons. The programme this year, if it pass by the committee and the House and Congress, will add only 63,000 tons to the tonnage of our Navy; and so I say to you that it is a moderate increase, it is a healthy increase, but I believe that it is none too large if we are to continue the policy

of building up the American Navy, and building it up in such strength and power as to maintain the honor of our country and to back up our foreign policy in every port and harbor throughout the world. [Applause.]

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Chairman, if it will not interrupt the gentleman from Illinois, I would like to ask him whether or not the building of these ships in the navy-yards of the United States is an experiment. I notice by the report, on page 19, that it states "that it is believed by your committee that nothing short of experiment of this kind will settle the question that affects many minds." Is this an experiment or has it been tried before, and if so, whether it was successful?

Mr. FOSS. It has been tried before, and I will reach the discussion of that question a little later. I want, in the first place, to call the attention of the committee to the present condition of the American Navy. In the report which I have the honor to make for the committee, after presenting a table of the number of ships that have already been built and which are now building, I made this statement, which has attracted, I may say, some little public attention:

It will be seen from the above table that while we have built and are building, all told, 138 ships, yet comparatively few of them have any real fighting value. Our naval prowess lies almost entirely in our 18 battle ships, 8 armored cruisers, and 21 protected cruisers. The rest of our ships would cut but little figure in actual warfare. Ships of the battle line practically alone determine the naval strength of a nation.

I mean by that, not ships of the battle line in the technical and historical sense, because that would refer simply to battle ships, but ships of the battle line in the larger and broader sense, including armored cruisers and protected cruisers. Now, I say that while we have built 138 ships, and are building them to-day, yet we have not a navy of which we can boast. We have only 10 battle ships already built and 8 under construction, and yet Secretary Tracy said in one of his reports that we have no business to consider that we had a navy until we have at least 20 battle ships. We have a good many ships upon the list of vessels which any of you can see if you will read the reports of the Navy Department, but most of these boats are peace boats, and in this connection I do not wish to have you take my statement alone, but take the statement of one of the ablest of our naval authorities, the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, Admiral Charles O'Neil. In a speech which he made before the New York Yacht Club not long ago he said something about the strength of our present Navy. Said he:

It might be advisable to fool other nations if we could with regard to our naval strength, but we surely do not want to fool ourselves, and a little introspection may be beneficial even if our national pride suffers somewhat in comparison.

Now let us see exactly how we stand:

The Navy list of January 1, 1902, contains the names of 243 completed vessels and of 60 in process of construction, a total of 303 vessels, and a very respectable showing, so far as numbers go. The question is, What are these 303 vessels and how many of them have any real military value? Of the completed vessels I find that 8 are unserviceable wooden ships of ancient date, which will probably soon be sold to the highest bidder. One is an old iron, paddle-wheel steamer, the *Monocacy*, which has been in Chinese waters for over thirty years and ought to have been in the scrap heap years ago. One is the Spanish cruiser *Reina Mercedes*, which was sunk by the Spaniards at Santiago de Cuba, was afterwards raised, and of which it is proposed to make a sailing training ship; 6 are old wooden frigates, used for receiving ships; 39 are tugboats; 1 is the so-called dynamite cruiser *Vesuvius*, having no military value; 1 is the ram *Katahdin*, a pronounced failure; 5 are purchased steamers, used as training ships for landsmen and having no military value; 8 are old-fashioned wooden sailing sloops of war, used by the Naval Militia and for State marine schools; 2 are wooden training ships for apprentices; 1 is a small sailing practice vessel for the cadets at Annapolis; 6 are old single-turreted monitors, with cast-iron, smooth-bore guns, relics of the civil war and of no value; 16 are colliers; 10 are supply vessels, tank steamers, and refrigerating ships; 48 are little gunboats, varying from 400 to 500 tons, mostly captured or bought in the Philippines, and 28 are torpedo boats, only useful for special purposes. That is to say, that 181 of the 243 completed vessels now on the Navy list have practically no fighting qualities; in fact, absolutely none, if we may except the torpedo boats.

Of the 62 remaining vessels, 10 are battle ships; 2, the *New York* and *Brooklyn*, are armored cruisers; 14 are second and third class cruisers like the *Chicago*, *Baltimore*, *Cincinnati*, and *Detroit*; 30 are small cruisers and gunboats like the *Yorktown*, *Nashville*, and others; and 6 are double-turreted monitors, suitable only for harbor defense.

Of these 62 vessels, at least 30 are so insignificant that they would cut but little figure in a war with any strong power. Thus it will be seen that our effective fighting power to-day is about 32 vessels; hence we can lay no claim to any great importance as yet as a naval power.

Then he goes on and speaks of the vessels which we are now building.

Fortunately—

He says—

We have a very respectable building programme now under way, as the ships now building will equal in fighting efficiency all the rest of the Navy. Of the 60 vessels now under construction, 8 are first-class battle ships; 3 are large armored cruisers, much more powerful than the *New York*; 6 are partially protected cruisers of 3,200 tons displacement; 4 are harbor-defense monitors; 16 are torpedo-boat destroyers; 10 are torpedo boats, and 7 submarine boats.

We may safely add 27 of the above vessels to our 32 of to-day, which will, in about three years' time, give us 59 good fighting vessels, 18 of which will be battle ships, 8 armored cruisers, 10 monitors, and about 23 protected and

partially protected cruisers; and we shall also have about 57 torpedo vessels and a lot of small gunboats and miscellaneous auxiliary craft, useful in their proper sphere.

From the foregoing it will be seen that we are deficient in powerful fighting vessels, and it behooves us to push on with the construction of battle ships and armored cruisers until we have a respectable number of each, not wasting our energies or money on a lot more miscellaneous small craft until we have accomplished the more important contraction.

And that recommendation is in line with that of this committee. We recommend two great battle ships, the largest we have ever built, ships the plans for which have already attracted the eyes of the naval authorities of the countries of the world, and in addition to that, two great armored cruisers, practically battle ships; and then we have put in a couple of small gunboats. But the policy of the committee, if I can in any measure speak for it, I think, is almost unanimously for putting the people's money into real fighting ships, ships of the battle line, and not into a whole lot of peace boats which do not amount to anything at all.

Now, I know that there are some—we hear it here and there and everywhere—who think that just because we whipped Spain in a fight of a hundred days and only lost a single life we could wipe out the fleets of the navies of the world. There is an impression which has gone out that the American Navy is strong and mighty and powerful. Yes; it is, so far as it goes. I believe we have better officers, better men, and that our ships, ship for ship, are better than those of any navy in the world. But do not let us delude ourselves with the thought that because we whipped a little nation, which had only a little navy, therefore we can whip anything that comes along. Why, it would have been our everlasting shame if our two fleets at Manila and Santiago had not sunk both of the Spanish fleets. Why? Because they were superior; they had a greater tonnage, each of them. I have here a statement which I propose to insert in the RECORD, showing the relative comparison of the two fleets at the battle of Manila and the battle of Santiago, and while I would not for a single moment disparage the bravery and the courage of our American officers and men and the value of our ships, yet, if there is any lesson to be learned from the Spanish-American war, it is that superior men, superior ships—in tonnage, in armament, and in armor—superior gunnery, and superior marksmanship will win in the future as they have won in the past. [Applause.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,
OFFICE OF NAVAL INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, D. C., May 1, 1902.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with your request of the 29th ultimo for information relative to the size of the two fleets, Spanish and American, at the battles of Manila Bay and Santiago, I have the honor to transmit herewith a memorandum which contains the desired data.

Very respectfully,

J. H. GIBBONS,
Lieutenant-Commander, U. S. Navy,
Acting Chief Intelligence Officer.

Hon. GEORGE EDMUND FOSS,
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

ENGAGEMENT IN MANILA BAY, MAY 1, 1898.

APRIL 30, 1902.

From the following tables it will be seen that the Spanish had a numerical superiority in ships and men. The data for the Spanish force is taken from *Estado General de la Armada* for 1898, and, as the complements there given are on a peace footing, it is reasonable to suppose that the numbers are a low estimate.

Leaving aside shore batteries and submarine defenses, there can be no question as to the superiority of the American ships and armaments over the Spanish. As to the extent of this superiority, the following comparison of armaments of the two fleets is given:

MAIN BATTERY.

Guns.	American.	Spanish.
8-inch	10	0
6-inch	23	7 6.3-inch. 3 5.9-inch.
5-inch	20	4 5.1-inch. 22 4.7-inch.
Total.....	53	36

SECONDARY BATTERY.

Guns.	American.	Spanish.
3-inch	2	2 3.54-inch. 2 3.43-inch. 4 2.95-inch.
2.25-inch, 6-pounder.....	34	8 2.76-inch. 9 2.24-inch.
1.85-inch, 3-pounder.....	10	10 1.65 inch.
1.46-inch, 1-pounder.....	27	24
Machine or mitrailleuse.....	9	12
Total.....	82	71

THE AMERICAN FLEET.					THE AMERICAN FLEET—continued.				
Name of ship.	Date of launch- ing.	Dis- place- ment.	Protection.	Armament.	Name of ship.	Date of launch- ing.	Dis- place- ment.	Protection.	Armament.
Olympia	1892	Tons. 5,870	Protective deck, 4.75 to 2 inch; 2 barbettes, 4.5-inch; 2 turrets, 6-inch; conning tower, 5-inch; sponsons, 4-inch and 2-inch.	4 8-inch, 10 5-inch, 14 2.25-inch, 7 1.46-inch, 1 machine.	Boston	1884	Tons. 3,000	Protective deck, 1.5-inch.	2 8-inch, 6 6-inch, 2 2.25-inch, 4 1.85-inch, 4 1.46-inch, 1 machine.
Baltimore	1888	4,413	Protective deck, 4-inch to 2.5-inch.	4 8-inch, 6 6-inch, 4 2.25-inch, 2 1.85-inch, 6 1.46-inch, 1 3-inch, 2 machine.	Concord	1890	1,710	None	6 6-inch, 2 2.25 inch, 2 1.85 inch, 3 1.46-inch, 2 machine.
Raleigh	1892	3,213	Protective deck, 2.5-inch to 1-inch.	1 6-inch, 10 5-inch, 8 2.25-inch, 4 1.46-inch, 1 3-inch, 1 machine.	Petrel	1888	892	do	4 6-inch, 2 1.85 inch, 3 1.46 inch, 2 machine.
					McCulloch	1896	1,280	do	4 2.25-inch.
					Total complement, 1,896 officers and men.				

THE SPANISH FLEET.						
Name of ship.	Date of launch.	Material of hull.	Displace- ment.	Protection.	Comple- ment.	Armament.*
Reina Christina	1886	Iron	Tons. 3,520	None	352	6 6.3-inch H.; 3 2.24-inch N.; 2 1.65-inch N.; 2 2.75-inch N.; 6 1.46-inch R. C.; 2 43-inch M.
Castilla	1881	Wood	3,260	do	349	4 5.12-inch K.; 2 4.72-inch K.; 2 3.43-inch K.; 4 2.95-inch K.; 4 1.65-inch N.; 4 1.46-inch R. C.
Don Juan de Austria	1887	Iron	1,159	do	179	4 4.72-inch H.; 2 2.76-inch H.; 2 1.65-inch N.; 4 1.46-inch R. C.; 1 43-inch M.
Don Antonio de U- loa	1887	do	1,160	do	159	4 4.72-inch H.; 2 2.76-inch H.; 2 2.24-inch R. F.; 4 1.46-inch R. C.; 1 43-inch M.
Isla de Cuba	1886	Steel	1,045	Protective deck, 2.44 inches.	156	4 4.72-inch H.; 2 2.24-inch R. F.; 2 1.46-inch R. C.; 1 43-inch M.; 1 1.46-inch R. F.
Isla de Luzon	1886	do	1,045	do	156	Do.
Marques del Duero	1875	do	500	None	96	1 6.3-inch P.; 2 4.72-inch B. R.; 1 43-inch N.
General Lezo	1883	Iron	520	do	115	2 4.72-inch H.; 1 8.54-inch H.; 2 .98-inch N.; 1 43-inch M.
Velasco	1881	do	1,152	do	147	3 5.91-inch A.; 2 2.76-inch H.; 2 .98-inch N.
Argos	1880	do	508	do	87	1 3.54-inch H.
Manila	1883	Iron	1,900	do	77	2 1.65-inch B. R.
Isla de Mindanao					120	
Total					1,993	

*H. = Hontoria, N. = Nordenfeldt, R. C. = Hotchkiss revolving cannon, M. = Mitrailleuse, K. = Krupp, P. = Pallisser, A. = Armstrong, B. R. = Bronze rifled.
 * Armed transport; took part in battle; armament and complement not known—later estimated at 120.

Engagement at Santiago de Cuba, July 3, 1898.

SPANISH FLEET.

Name of ship.	Date of launch.	Trial speed.	Ton- nage.	Protection.	Crew.	Armament.
Infanta Maria Teresa	1890	Knots. 20.2	6,890	Armor belt, 12 to 10 and 9 inch; protective deck, 3 to 2 inch.	556	2 11-inch, 10 5.5-inch, 8 6-pounder Q. F., 10 1-pounder Q. F., 10 machine.
Viscaya	1891	20.2	6,890	do	491	Do.
Almirante Oquendo	1891	20.2	6,890	do	487	Do.
Cristobal Colon	1896	19.8	6,840	Armor belt, 6 to 2 inch; protective deck, 1 1/2 inch.	567	10 6-inch, 6 4.7-inch Q. F., 10 6-pounder, Q. F., 10 1-pounder Q. F., 2 machine.
Pluton	1897	30	400	None	80	2 14-pounder Q. F., 2 6-pounders Q. F., 2 1-pounder Q. F.
Furor	1896	28	370	do	80	Do.

AMERICAN FLEET.

Name of ship.	Date of launch.	Trial speed.	Ton- nage.	Protection.	Crew.	Armament.
Indiana	1893	15.5	10,230	Armor belt, 18 to 10 inch; protective deck, 8-inch.	571	4 13-inch, 8 8-inch, 4 6-inch, 206-pounders, 7 1-pounders, 2 machine.
Oregon	1893	16.7	10,230	do	524	Do.
Iowa	1896	17.1	11,206	Armor belt, 14 to 10 inch; protective deck, 8-inch.	587	4 12-inch, 8 8-inch, 6 4-inch, Q. F., 20 6-pounders, 2 1-pounders, 4 machine.
Texas	1892	17.8	6,900	Armor belt, 12 to 9 inch; protective deck, 3-inch.	433	2 12-inch, 6 6-inch, 126-pounders, 10 1-pounders, 2 machine.
Brooklyn	1895	22	9,153	Armor belt, 4 1/2-inch; protective deck, 3 to 6 inch.	552	8 8-inch, 12 5-inch Q. F., 12 6-pounders, 4 1-pounders, 4 machine.
Gloucester	1891	18	800	None	93	4 6-pounders, 4 3-pounders, 2 machine.
Vixen		12	165	do		4 6-pounders, 4 3-pounders.
New York	1891	21	8,480	Armor belt, 8.8-inch; protective deck, 2.5 to 6 inch.	652	6 8-inch, 12 4-inch Q. F., 8 6-pounders, 2 1-pounders, 2 machine.
Ericsson	1892	23	120	None	21	41-pounders.

So the lesson that comes to us, as the result of our recent war with Spain, is not to stop building, but to build onward and upward the American Navy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I come to another question. We have provided in this bill for a naval programme which I say, in my judgment and the judgment of the committee, is a healthy one, a conservative one, on the lines of our past policy, and a naval programme which I think will meet with approval everywhere throughout the country. But it is necessary in this bill to provide also how these ships shall be constructed. Heretofore it has been the policy of our country, with but few exceptions, to construct our ships in private yards, because I think it has been the consensus of public opinion that they could be constructed more cheaply there than in our Government navy-yards.

Many of you have received a great deal of literature upon this question of the construction of ships in Government navy-yards.

I have some of it here. You may recognize it, perhaps, as I hold it up for you to look at. These cards have been sent to members of Congress, calling their attention from time to time to the wisdom of constructing ships in Government navy-yards. Now, I desire to say a few words upon this question. In the first place, I desire to call your attention to the fact that all of these cards come from the Chamber of Commerce of Vallejo, Cal. It was my pleasure to visit that little city last summer, and I was very pleasantly entertained there. They are very much interested in building ships in Government navy-yards there. Why? I will say, in the first place, that this is a city of about 7,000 population. It has comparatively few industries of its own.

Most of the people or laboring men there depend absolutely for employment upon the navy-yard across the river. They are naturally in favor of building ships in Government navy-yards. They are naturally anxious to call attention of members of

Congress to this. They would not only like to build one ship there, but they would like to build the whole American Navy there. Why? Because, as I say, they are absolutely dependent upon Government work in order to feed, clothe, and to keep themselves and their families alive. That is an honest, legitimate ambition. I have nothing to say against it, but I have something to say against the fallacious statements and misrepresentations of fact which have been sent out upon these cards to members of Congress. If they contained the truth I would not say anything. But when they try to influence your vote and mine with misstatements of fact I think it is only proper that somebody should call attention to the matter.

Mr. METCALF. Do I understand the gentleman to say the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce has made misstatements as to the condition of the Navy?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; some misstatements.

Mr. METCALF. I wish you would point out where any misstatements have been made.

Mr. FOSS. Now, here is a card which has been sent out by the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce:

From the Paymaster-General of the Navy's report for 1899, page 36, we find the value of navy-yard plants which are used for the repairing of vessels to be \$42,395,136. There has since then been appropriated \$51,893,297, making the enormous sum of \$94,288,433. The Bureau of Yards and Docks has recommended to this Congress that \$18,786,075 additional be appropriated, making in all \$113,074,508.

As the Bureau of Yards and Docks have all the quay walls, dry docks, sidewalks, buildings, and other improvements built by contract (see Secretary of the Navy's report for 1901, pages 219 to 245), it is the incentive for the contractors to help the Bureau build up the plants.

Value of plants, January 1, 1902.

Portsmouth, N. H.	\$6,929,080
Boston	17,849,761
Brooklyn	29,021,068
Philadelphia	9,344,963
Norfolk	9,810,610
Port Royal	3,427,910
Pensacola	2,595,475
Mare Island	11,178,752
Bremerton	3,060,994
Algiers	1,470,000
	94,288,433
Additional appropriations asked for	18,786,075
Total valuation to date	113,074,508

This vast sum represents more money than is invested in all the ship-building plants of this country engaged in the building of Government ships. Those in authority claim the navy-yards can not build battle ships because of the lack of the proper facilities, notwithstanding the expenditure of this enormous sum for such purposes.

From the Paymaster-General of the Navy's report for 1901 we find under the heading:

STATEMENT D.

Statement showing expenditures for maintenance and improvements at the several naval stations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901:

Portsmouth, N. H.	\$766,875
Boston	1,252,408
Brooklyn	3,437,536
Philadelphia	1,257,019
Norfolk	1,532,722
Port Royal	305,206
Pensacola	296,577
Mare Island	1,478,104
Bremerton	442,897
Algiers	285,402
Total under titles G, E, and F	10,854,546

TITLE D.

Repairs to vessels, report 1900, labor and material, Title D	\$3,312,961
Repairs to vessels, report 1901, labor and material, Title D	5,001,571
Total repairs for two years	8,314,532
Average repairs per year at all the navy-yards	4,157,266

SUMMARY.

Value of plants used for repairing vessels	113,074,510
Interest at 3 per cent per annum	3,392,235
Cost of maintenance per year, Titles G, E, and F	10,854,546
Total cost of maintenance per year	14,246,781
Repairs to vessels per year, Title D	4,157,266
Amount expended per year	18,404,047

There is no record of any new construction work having been done.

This is a startling summary to place before the country; a plant costing \$113,074,510, in operation, expending \$18,404,047 annually, to produce \$4,157,266 in results.

The navy-yards at the present time are used for no other purpose but that of repairing vessels; they should also be engaged in building the new Navy, instead of being comparatively idle as they now are. Every private yard in this country is congested with work; every Government contract ship under construction is from twenty months to three years behind contract time. The lobby of the combine pleaded with the last Congress to appropriate no more money for the increase of the Navy for that session because they could not build what they already had under construction.

If there were \$20,000,000 worth of new construction work at the navy-yards, the cost for maintenance would not be greater than it now is.

If the Government can not build battle ships in the plants represented by this immense investment, don't you think that it is time to close the navy-yards or get some one else to run them?

And here is a comment, not of mine, but the comment of Admiral Bowles, Chief Constructor of the American Navy, the head of the Bureau:

This card—

Says Admiral Bowles—

alleging that the Government has a plant in operation costing \$113,000,000, spending \$18,000,000 annually to produce \$4,000,000 in results, is a perversion of the figures. The Paymaster General's report (page 814 of the Secretary's report of 1899) gives the appraised value of the navy-yards and naval stations at that date as \$42,395,136, about 90 per cent of which is real estate and over \$20,000,000 of which is the value of the real estate of the Brooklyn Navy-Yard. In order to make up the difference between this and \$113,000,000 the makers of this card have added all the appropriations for improvements to the navy-yards made since 1899—

And in this connection I will say upon my own authority, they have added the estimates for this year to the amount of \$18,786,000, which we have reduced to \$6,500,000 in order to make up this \$113,000,000.

The makers of this card—

Says Admiral Bowles—

have added all the appropriations for improvements to the navy-yards made since 1899, a great portion of which is not yet expended, and even if it were, can not be added to the previous appraisal to obtain the present value.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. FOSS. Wait until I get through with this. And not only that, but these cards have gone upon the theory and supposition that the chief and only business of a navy-yard is to repair ships. Well, now, that is not the fact. Admiral Bowles says a very large proportion—considerably more than one-half—of the value of the navy-yards has no relation to their value as industrial establishments for doing work in the construction and repair of vessels, and relates to the functions of the navy-yards as arsenals and depots for the maintenance of public property in the way of guns, ammunition, food, and stores of all kinds, which have to do with the maintaining and keeping of the naval supplies, and is entirely apart from the industrial and mechanical business of construction and repair. This will be clear to you when I explain that at the date of appraisal, in 1899, the total value of the machinery plant of the navy-yards doing repair work amounted to less than 10 per cent of their total value.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman kindly state the date of that card?

Mr. FOSS. I can not say; there is no date on the inside.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Some time this year?

Mr. FOSS. It is a card I received during the last few months.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to call the attention of the chairman to the fact that Admiral Bowles refers to an appraisal made in 1899. I call the attention to the appraisal given in his own report, showing the value June 30, 1901, that the total value of all the yards, machinery, and equipment aggregates \$78,900,000; and eliminating the foreign—if we can call them foreign—naval stations, the chairman's own reports bring the value of these plants to over \$70,000,000.

Mr. METCALF. Nearly \$80,000,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It brings it up to \$30,000,000 more than what the gentleman says Admiral Bowles puts it at.

Mr. FOSS. That takes in the foreign stations.

Mr. METCALF. It takes them all in.

Mr. FOSS. In the card you will find that this is the basis for their statement that has been sent out; i. e., they quote from exactly the same report, from the Paymaster-General of the Navy report in 1899, page 34, where we find the value of the navy-yard plants used for repairing vessels put at \$42,395,000. Admiral Bowles has taken their card and shown from their own card that they have perverted facts.

Mr. RIXEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. FOSS. I prefer to go along now.

Mr. RIXEY. I simply wanted to know if the statement of Admiral Bowles was a public document?

Mr. FOSS. It will be in to-morrow's RECORD; it has not been published yet. Now, as to another statement—

Mr. METCALF. Will the gentleman pardon me? In fairness, having criticised the statement sent out by the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce, I ask that he publish this card for the purpose of showing whether or not any misstatement has been made. I think it is but fair that that should go into the RECORD.

Mr. FOSS. Now, Mr. Chairman, here is another card which has been sent out by the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce, and upon

it you will see the picture of two ships, one the *Monterey* and the other the *Monadnock*. The *Monterey* was built at the Union Iron Works, and the *Monadnock* was built at Mare Island Navy-Yard.

Now, they made the statement on this card that the difference in cost to date as between these two vessels which they say are very nearly alike, but upon which there is justly a great difference of opinion, that the difference in cost to date is \$530,000 in favor of the ship built at the Mare Island Navy-Yard. Now, I want to read you what Admiral Bowles, the chief constructor in the Navy, says about that:

MEMORANDUM FOR THE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 21, 1902.

In regard to the comparative statements of the cost of the *Monadnock*, built by the Government, and the *Monterey*, built by contract, the principal error made in the statements on these cards consists in the entire omission of the amounts expended by the Government on the *Monadnock* in the construction of the hull and machinery up to the time that the vessel was turned over to the Mare Island Navy-Yard for completion, under the authority granted by the act of March 3, 1883, so that the statements of cost given by the Vallesjo Chamber of Commerce include only the amounts expended subsequent to that date. An accurate statement of the comparative cost of the hull and machinery of the *Monadnock* and *Monterey* is given below, and instead of showing that the *Monadnock* was built at the navy-yard for \$530,981 less than the Union Iron Works built the *Monterey*, on the contrary the *Monadnock* cost \$337,199.16 more than the *Monterey* for corresponding items.

Under the circumstances, it is not necessary to cumber this account with any description of the differences existing between the vessels which make the *Monterey* a much more valuable and expensive ship if contemporaneously built.

Cost of *Monadnock*.

Hull prior to act of 1883	\$585,600.61
Hull since act of 1883	941,800.77
Steam engineering prior to act of 1883	98,110.01
Steam engineering since act of 1883	501,331.81
Ordnance since act of 1883	79,352.29
Equipment since act of 1883	3,783.78
Total	2,209,979.27

Corresponding cost of *Monterey*.

Hull and machinery, paid contractors	\$1,632,985.06
Extras to contractors:	
Construction and repair	121,236.60
Steam engineering	32,823.00
Trial-trip expenses	11,547.42
Total paid contractors	1,799,192.08
Work done by Government:	
Construction and repair	67,094.55
Steam engineering	4,549.43
Ordnance	1,386.16
Equipment	617.89
Total	1,872,780.11

F. T. BOWLES,

Chief Constructor United States Navy.

Mr. METCALF. That statement made in that card was taken from Senate Document 175, furnished by the Secretary of the Navy, and they have subsequently corrected it in another card giving the absolute cost of the ship to the Government. The gentleman from Illinois must have received that subsequent card and statement.

Mr. FOSS. No; I have not received it.

Mr. METCALF. I have received it, and I will explain it at the proper time.

Mr. FOSS. Now, there is another matter—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Before the gentleman passes from that point, will he say whether it is stated there that the cost of undoing work which had been done was estimated by one of the naval constructors as greater than the cost of doing the work from the beginning?

Mr. FOSS. I did not catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask the gentleman whether it does not appear from that card that a naval constructor has given it as his opinion that tearing out the work which had been done by contract amounted practically to as much, if not more, than the building of the entire ship anew.

Mr. FOSS. I do not find that statement here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If that statement is made, I think the House should know it.

Mr. FOSS. Here is the card. If the gentleman can find it there, well and good.

Now, here is another card which has been sent out, showing the cost of different vessels.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSS. I ask unanimous consent that I may finish my remarks.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask that the gentleman be allowed to proceed until he has concluded his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. That consent is unnecessary, as the gentleman controls the time himself.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will go on and tell us all he can about this bill.

Mr. FOSS. Here is another card showing the cost of the different vessels. Admiral Bowles has taken one of these cards which has been sent to members of Congress and furnishes this statement thereon. Here is the card:

	Gross tonnage.	Cost of hull and machinery.	Built by—	Cost per ton, hull and machinery.	Cost of finished vessel.	Displacement.	Cost per ton of finished vessel.
1890.	Tons.					Tons.	
Oregon	5,591	\$3,222,810	Union	\$576	\$3,575,000	10,288	\$639
Massachusetts	5,239	3,063,000	Cramp	579	6,047,117	10,288	587
Indiana	5,239	3,063,000	do	578	5,933,371	10,288	581
1892.							
Iowa	6,294	3,010,000	do	478	5,871,206	11,340	562
1895.							
Kearsarge	6,831	2,250,000	Newport	329	5,593,977	11,540	485
Kentucky	7,087	2,250,000	do	317	5,482,455	11,540	475
1896.							
Illinois	6,802	2,595,000	do	381	5,844,184	11,565	505
Alabama	6,802	2,650,000	Cramp	389	6,028,313	11,565	511
Wisconsin	6,802	2,674,950	Union	393	6,035,291	11,653	510
1898.							
Maine	7,139	2,885,000	Cramp	404	5,674,141	12,300	461
Missouri	7,179	2,885,000	Newport	402	5,677,550	12,290	464
Ohio	7,384	2,899,000	Union	392	5,612,837	12,440	451
1901.							
Virginia			Newport		6,176,612	15,014	404
Pennsylvania			Cramp		5,236,413	14,014	373

We find from the accompanying table that the prices of finished ships have fallen from \$639 per ton in 1890, when the Union and the Cramps had no opposition, to \$451 in 1898, when they had the competition of the Newport News, and to \$404 per ton in 1901, when they had the competition of the Bath Iron Works, Fore River Ship Company, the Morans, and the Newport News.

Or, had they built the Ohio in 1890 instead of in 1898, and had charged for her the same price that they charged for building the Oregon, viz, \$539 per ton, she would have cost \$7,939,160 instead of \$5,612,837, a difference of \$2,327,323.

We take the hull and machinery as a basis to figure the profit to the contractor, as the price of armor does not figure in the building. It is said that the Newport News built the hull and machinery of the Kentucky for about cost, which is \$317 per ton. Granting this to be true, we find that the Union Iron Works charged \$576 per ton for the Oregon, a profit of \$1,428,079. Adding speed premium, \$175,000, will make a total profit of \$1,603,079 on the hull and machinery.

Profit on the *Massachusetts*, adding speed premium, \$100,000, makes a net profit of \$1,569,851. Profit on the *Indiana*, speed premium of \$38,500, makes a net profit of \$1,392,304. There were, in addition to these figures, from \$150,000 to \$250,000 paid as extras on the hull and machinery, principally for changes, the profit on which was not less than two-thirds. This should be added to their net profits as stated above.

Profit on the *Iowa*, \$984,652. Add speed premium of \$217,430 makes a net profit of \$1,202,072.

From 1890 to 1901 the prices paid for material and wages has been steadily increasing, while the prices charged by the contractors for finished ships has been steadily decreasing.

From the above you can see what competition has done for the Government.

Do you wonder that the contractors oppose the building of battle ships in the navy-yards? We do not, for we know the profits they have made in the past.

They do not want the competition of the navy-yards.

Why not divide the profits with the horny-handed sons of toil instead of giving it all to the favored few? The latter are now rich enough.

Here is the statement of Admiral Bowles:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1902.

This card gives the cost of each of the battle ships, per gross ton, which is an unsuitable method of comparison, as the gross tonnage merely represents the cubical capacity of the hull, and therefore is not a measure of the contract work.

I inclose a table of cost of battle ships, based upon the contract weight, exclusive of armor and armament—that is, the cost per ton is the cost per ton of weight contracted for in the hull, machinery, and fittings. Down to the *Wisconsin* in this table the figures are the actual returned cost—that is, including the contract price and extras. From the *Maine* to the *Pennsylvania* it is the contract price alone, and the amounts will probably show, when completed, from \$20 to \$30 more per ton. It is true that the *Kearsarge* and *Kentucky* were built at probably less than cost, and the price, \$385 per ton, certainly involves no profit. The first battle ships, *Oregon*, *Massachusetts*, and *Indiana*, must have brought a considerable profit to the builders, but since their time the profits have not been unreasonable, and this table clearly shows the advantages of competition.

F. T. BOWLES,
Chief Constructor United States Navy.

Cost of battle ships.

	Contract weight.	Cost of hull and machinery, trial, and extras.	Cost per ton.	Contract year.
	Tons.			
Oregon.....	5,691.10	\$3,736,180.67	*\$654	1890
Massachusetts.....	5,691.10	3,539,570.33	*586	1890
Indiana.....	5,691.10	3,261,657.22	*573	1890
Iowa.....	6,492.90	3,235,614.71	*498	1893
Kearsarge.....	6,339.21	2,441,616.49	*385	1896
Kentucky.....	6,339.21	2,442,292.62	*385	1896
Illinois.....	6,391.72	2,631,023.33	*415	1896
Alabama.....	6,391.72	2,755,206.59	*431	1896
Wisconsin.....	6,391.72	2,787,696.65	*436	1896
Maine.....	7,184.91	2,885,000.00	*401	1898
Missouri.....	7,184.91	2,885,000.00	*401	1898
Ohio.....	7,184.91	2,899,000.00	*403	1898
Virginia.....	8,874.00	3,590,000.00	*405	1901
Pennsylvania.....	9,571.00	3,890,000.00	*406	1901

* Actual returned cost.

* Contract price.

Now, here are some more cards which have been sent out.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. As to some of these ships, was not a part of the hull built in Europe and brought over here?

Mr. FOSS. The gentleman may refer to two ships which were bought during the Spanish war—the *Albany* and the *New Orleans*, which were built at Sir William Thomson's works, I think.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. My information—given, I believe, on some of these cards—is that the machinery or some part of some of these vessels was bought in some foreign country. Was it the *Texas*?

Mr. FOSS. The plans of the *Texas* were designed by an Englishman in the employ of Sir William Thomson. I may say that I met the gentleman two years ago. Those were plans purchased by Secretary Whitney, who, I think, paid in the neighborhood of \$25,000 for them. But since then our own American designers have planned all our ships.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman will pardon me for interrupting, but I would like to know whether the plans which we bought abroad and which were used on the *Texas* were satisfactory. Have they not proved unsatisfactory?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; I think they have proved unsatisfactory. A great many alterations were necessary in the *Texas*, amounting, perhaps, to \$300,000 all told. I presume that those alterations were necessitated in some degree by the defects in the plans.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. My information is that they were.

Mr. FOSS. I think perhaps that was almost entirely the cause, although it may have been somewhat from other causes.

Mr. MAYNARD. Is it not a fact that plans which had been rejected by the English Government were purchased by the United States?

Mr. FOSS. I do not know whether that was the fact.

Mr. MAYNARD. Is it not generally conceded to have been the fact?

Mr. FOSS. I have heard a good deal to that effect.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. One of these cards states that as a fact.

A MEMBER. There is no denial of it.

Mr. LESSLER. Who did the gentleman say bought those plans?

Mr. FOSS. Secretary Whitney.

There are a number of things stated on these cards which are not absolutely true. I do not wish to state that the gentleman who sent out these cards and who was responsible for these so-called facts is willfully and maliciously trying to hoodwink the American Congress. I only desire to say that the real facts are not accurately stated, and I think this House ought to know it.

Now, here is an interesting card which has been sent out: "Some nuts for the combine to crack." Now, I do not stand here representing any combine; I do not stand here representing the shipbuilders of this country. I have no affiliations with them whatever. I simply stand here to call the attention of members of this House to the actual facts. I do not care whether the ships are built in the navy-yards or whether they are built under private contract, but as a representative of the American people, realizing that it costs millions and millions of dollars to build up a navy, six and seven millions to build a battle ship, six and seven millions to build an armored cruiser, and after you have completed each, \$1,000 a day to maintain it; realizing that the American Navy is a great, yes, a great, luxury, you may say, in times of peace, but an absolute and mighty necessity in times of war; realizing that we must have a navy and that it costs many millions to build it, as a representative of the American people I propose to see to it that the money that we put into the building of ships and into the maintenance of our men and officers and into the maintenance of our naval yards on the shore shall go

the very farthest that a dollar will for the public interest and for the public welfare. [Applause.]

If it costs less to build ships in the navy-yards, I am for building ships in the navy-yards; if it costs less to build them under private contract, I am for that. But I am above all for the construction of our ships just where it will cost the least money and take a less number of dollars out of the pockets of the American people. Now, what about this card, "Some nuts to crack?" Let us crack a few. This is what the card says:

When the present stone dock at Mare Island Navy-Yard was completed the Government gave the contract to construct the caisson to the Union Iron Works for \$78,000.

A few years later they needed a new caisson, and the job of building it was given to the Mare Island mechanics, who built it for \$37,000. It is heavier and of better workmanship than the one constructed for the Government by the Union Iron Works. The Government saved on this job \$41,000, or over 100 per cent. This gives you an idea of what contractor's profits are.

Last year the Bureau of Yards and Docks wanted a barge built. They advertised for bids, and the Union Iron Works bid \$14,500, the Risdon Iron Works bid \$30,000, the mechanics at the Mare Island Navy-Yard bid to do the work for \$12,500. As the amount allotted for the job was but \$10,000 the plans were modified and the navy-yard, on account of the showing on the other bidding, was given the job. The barge was built for less than the amount estimated.

Here is a letter from Admiral Bowles, in which he says that Admiral Endicott has furnished him with accompanying memoranda relative to the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce card, and concerning the first three paragraphs in regard to a caisson and a barge built at the Mare Island Navy-Yard:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1902.

DEAR MR. FOSS: Admiral Endicott has furnished me with the accompanying memoranda relating to a Vallejo Chamber of Commerce card, and concerning the first three paragraphs in regard to a caisson and a barge built at the Mare Island Navy-Yard.

In regard to the statements of cost for putting the armor on the *Monadnock*, I can only say that the usual price is from \$15 to \$20 a ton, so that I can not account for the statements herein made.

Very sincerely,

F. T. BOWLES.

Hon. GEO. EDMUND FOSS.

Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives.

Now, to read the memoranda:

MEMORANDA RELATIVE TO CRANE SCOW, NAVY-YARD, MARE ISLAND, CAL.
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS,
Washington, D. C., April 25, 1902.

The construction of a crane scow for the navy-yard, Mare Island, California, was authorized by the act of June 7, 1900, and \$12,000 appropriated therefor.

Under date of December 4, 1900, Civil Engineer Hollyday submitted a design for a barge, stating that the design was gotten up by the naval constructor at his request; that after it was prepared it was found that it could not be built within the appropriation; that he also secured estimates from the Union Iron Works and the Risdon Iron Works of San Francisco, both estimates being higher than the estimate of the naval constructor. The Bureau was never informed of the amount of any of the estimates. At the same time the civil engineer requested authority to construct a barge similar in design to the one shown, to cost not more than \$10,000, leaving \$2,000 for the installation of machinery and derrick.

Under date of December 20, 1900, the Bureau authorized the preparation of plans for a \$10,000 pontoon.

Under date of December 27, 1900, the civil engineer submitted drawings for a steel pontoon for a 40-ton derrick, stating that the naval constructor estimated the cost of the same to be \$10,000 manufactured in the yard.

Under date of January 15, 1901, the Bureau approved the plans and authorized the work to be done by the yard force, the entire work, including the installation of the derrick, to come within the appropriation of \$12,000.

Under date of February 19, 1902, the Bureau was informed that the scow was launched at 2.30 p. m., February 11, 1902.

The report of material and labor applied for the month of February shows that the following expenditures had been made to March 1, 1902, viz:

Materials.....	\$3,978.06
Labor.....	5,163.74
Total.....	9,141.80

The Bureau never advertised for bids for doing this work, and never authorized the navy-yard authorities to secure estimates from any contractors. It will be seen that the scow, as originally built, was upon a plan revised from that originally contemplated, and upon which estimates were made.

Mr. METCALF. All this shows is that the work was done for less than the amount appropriated.

Mr. FOSS. Now, about the caisson:

MEMORANDUM IN REGARD TO COST OF CAISSON FOR THE MARE ISLAND DRY DOCK.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS,
Washington, D. C., April 25, 1902.

The first was built in 1884 at a cost of \$56,000. It was constructed of iron at a time when prices were very high, plates costing from 0.0235 to 0.0240 of a cent per pound, angles about 0.0240 of a cent per pound, tees 0.0275 to 0.03 of a cent, beams and channels 0.0350 of a cent.

The caisson now in use was constructed in 1897, fourteen years after the first, and of steel, when prices were much lower than in 1883, shapes of different kinds varying from about 0.02 to 0.022 of a cent per pound. This caisson cost \$42,763.64.

The difference in cost between these two caissons is, therefore, \$13,236.36. This is accounted for to a great degree by the decreased cost of materials and in a measure by the fact that the first caisson was built upon a new and comparatively novel design, and, according to recollection, there was not much competition upon the letting of the first.

So that you will see from the reading of these cards that here are misstatements of facts, and we have here the testimony of the

chief of a great Bureau in the Navy Department as against the testimony of a man who does not put his name to the cards.

Mr. METCALF. It is not the testimony of the chief of the Bureau, but he takes the statement of the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Mr. FOSS. Practically the same thing.

Mr. METCALF. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. METCALF. You received some 40 or 50 of these cards?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; a good many of them.

Mr. METCALF. And the only ones you desire to criticize are those to which you call the attention of the committee?

Mr. FOSS. The only ones I desire to criticize are those I call attention to.

Mr. METCALF. Nearly all these cards you have submitted to the chief constructor of the Navy?

Mr. FOSS. No, sir.

Mr. METCALF. He has reported on nearly all of them.

Mr. FOSS. No; only a few of them, upon which I consider they based their argument in favor of building ships in the navy-yards, and I submitted them to the chief constructor.

Mr. METCALF. Has not he stated in the main that the facts stated in the cards are correct, that they correctly state the facts?

Mr. FOSS. In the main?

Mr. METCALF. Yes.

Mr. FOSS. There are very few facts given in any of these cards anyway, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. METCALF. You received a card, did you not, setting forth the time in which vessels were constructed in private yards, that there was not a single ship constructed under private contract that was finished in the time?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; I received a card of that character.

Mr. METCALF. Was that card submitted to Admiral Bowles?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; I think that card was submitted to Admiral Bowles.

Mr. METCALF. Have you his answer to it? If you have, I should like to have you read it.

Mr. FOSS. That was upon the question of the time. Now, I am talking about the question of comparative cost of building in Government navy-yards and under private contract, an entirely different question.

Here is another card and Admiral Bowles's comment upon it:

SHIPBUILDING IN GOVERNMENT NAVY-YARDS.

Conceding that labor is 40 per cent higher, the Government will build cheaper than will the contractors. Look over these figures:

Senate Document No. 175, Fifty-seventh Congress, page 9, shows that the Navy Department has paid under contract for hull and machinery the sum of \$45,621,720. They have paid to the contractors for changes \$2,628,132, or 5.76 per cent.

One example: The contract for the building of the *Virginia*, 7,500 tons, was given to the Newport News Company for \$3,590,000, which is at the rate of \$478 per ton.

The Newport News Company built the *Kentucky* and the *Kearsarge*, 6,831 and 7,087 tons; for \$917 per ton.

Figure that the profit of the *Virginia*, *Nebraska*, *Georgia*, *New Jersey*, and the *Rhode Island*, all sister ships, will be not less than \$100 per ton. It will probably be more than that, but take that amount to estimate with:

Contract cost of these ships, 7,500 tons, at \$478 \$3,590,000
Profit at basis of \$100 per ton 750,000

Cost of ship to the contractor 2,840,000

On ships of this class estimate that one half the contractor's cost is for material and the other half is for labor.

Contractor's cost for labor \$1,420,000
Contractor's cost for material 1,420,000

Total cost of ship for labor and material 2,840,000

Same ship if built in the navy-yards, granting that it does cost 40 per cent more for labor, the material does not cost any more, for the Government buys it as cheap as the contractor.

Contractor's cost for labor \$1,420,000
Add 40 per cent more, which, it is claimed, the Government has to pay for its labor in the navy-yards 568,000

Cost for labor in navy-yards 1,988,000

Cost of material for ship 1,420,000

Cost of ship in navy-yards 3,408,000

Cost of same ship, contract price for hull and machinery 3,590,000
Cost for changes, at 5.76 per cent 208,784
Inspection charges, estimated 20,000

Total cost of hull and machinery when built by contract 3,818,784

Cost of ship if built at the navy-yard 3,408,000

Difference in favor of the navy-yard 388,784

With all the handicap the navy-yards build the ships for less than the contractors charge the Government for the same ships.

There is also a large item of saving in the navy-yard built ship, for it costs less for repairs.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1902.

I have made a comparative statement of the cost of the *Virginia* built in a navy-yard and built by contract, upon the same method as shown on this, the

above card, but making the profit correspond to the actual difference in cost per ton of the *Virginia* and *Kearsarge*. I have also added 10 per cent to the material cost to the Government, and 70 per cent to the contract cost of labor, instead of 40 per cent as given on the card. The 40 per cent has been taken from the statements in my testimony before the Naval Committee, that the wages at navy-yards were from 30 to 40 per cent higher than the wages at private yards. This remark applied to the day's wage, and not to the cost of labor per hour, which is quite a different matter, as is explained on page 4 of this memorandum, showing that the cost of labor per hour in a navy-yard, owing to the difference of hours of labor and paid holidays, is 70 per cent more than it is in a private yard. On page 3 of this memorandum I have made a typical comparison in the way I think it should be made, in which I have allowed the cost of labor in a navy-yard to be double the contractor's labor, which I think would be nearer the truth than 70 per cent, and this brings the excess cost of the navy-yard ship, over the contract cost to be 25.8 per cent, and it is my opinion that this is a moderate estimate under present conditions.

F. T. BOWLES,
Chief Constructor United States Navy.

Cost of the *Virginia*, built in a navy-yard.

The actual cost of the hull and machinery of the *Kearsarge* as completed was \$2,441,616.49, and the actual weight of items contracted for, 6,839 tons, so that the cost per ton was \$355.

The cost per ton contract weight of the *Virginia* is \$404.55, amounting to \$3,590,000
Extras, at 5.76 per cent 208,784
Total 3,798,784
Final cost per ton 429

Assuming the difference in cost per ton to be profit, or \$44 per ton instead of \$100, as stated on this card:

Cost of *Virginia* \$3,798,784
Contractor's profit 890,456

Cost to contractor 3,408,328

Assume one-half cost to be labor and one-half material, it is my opinion that the material will cost 10 per cent more if purchased by the Government, and that under existing conditions of wages paid, hours of labor, absence of piecework, holidays, and leaves of absence with pay, I am of the opinion that the labor charges in the yards would be at least 70 per cent more.

Contractor's cost of labor plus 70 per cent \$2,895,385
Contractor's cost of material plus 10 per cent 1,773,480

Cost of *Virginia* built in navy-yard 4,668,865

Cost of *Virginia* built by contract.

Contract price \$3,590,000
Extras, at 5.76 per cent 208,784
Inspection 20,000

Total 3,818,784

Difference in favor of the contractor (equals 22 per cent of the contract cost) 852,081

Typical comparison of cost of ship built by contract and in Government navy-yards.

CONTRACT COST.

Labor, two-thirds of net cost \$1,600,000
Material, one-third of net cost 800,000

Net cost 2,400,000

General expense, 40 per cent 960,000

Total cost to contractor 3,360,000

Profit, at 10 per cent 336,000

Cost of Government inspection 35,000

Cost to Government 3,731,000

COST IN NAVY-YARD.

Labor, double contractor's labor 3,200,000
Material, contractor's material plus 10 per cent 880,000

Net cost 4,080,000

General expense, 15 per cent 612,000

Cost to Government 4,692,000

Excess (equals 25.8 per cent of contract cost) 961,000

Cost of labor per hour at a private yard.

[Average wage, \$2 per day.]

306 days, at 10 hours, at say \$2 per day, 3,060 hours \$612.00

Price per hour20

Cost of labor per hour at a navy-yard.

[Average wage, \$2.52 per day.]

365-52=313-(15+7) 22=291 days, 8 hours' work hours.. 2,328

313 days' pay, at \$2.52 \$788.76

Price per hour cents.. 33.88

Ratio (33.88÷.20) 1.694

Mr. WHEELER. I have listened with a good deal of interest to the arguments of the chairman of the committee, and I must confess to some degree of astonishment, in view of the fact that he is the author of this report, and I think he owes it to the committee to state whether or not he is now arguing against the construction of ships in Government navy-yards, and if so, whether he proposes to oppose that provision of the bill providing for the construction of at least a part of the ships in Government navy-yards.

Mr. FOSS. I will answer my friend from Kentucky. I am here advocating the naval appropriation bill as it was reported to the House from the Naval Committee. I am in favor of every proposition in this bill.

Mr. WHEELER. Then—

Mr. FOSS. Now, hold on just a moment. I believe that that

provision is wise which leaves it within the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy to build ships in the navy-yards, and makes it mandatory upon him to build one ship in a navy-yard. I stand for every provision in that bill; but I think it is my duty to call the attention of the members of the House to a whole bundle of misstatements which have been sent here which they have not the time, if they had the inclination, to investigate, so that when the proposition comes before the House they will have as broad and wide and large information as any member upon the Naval Committee. In other words, I propose that the House shall be fully informed.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I felt confident that the position of the gentleman was as he has stated it, and he will pardon me for saying that I think by dignifying these cards he has attracted much more attention to them than they would have otherwise received. I do not believe that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] has been misled by them, nor do I think any member of the committee or the House will be misled by them, and I do not think the gentleman is doing either himself or his committee justice in leaving the impression in the minds of some, possibly, that the controversy over the construction of ships in Government navy-yards grew out of the action of the Valjejo Commercial Club, or Chamber of Commerce, or whatever it may be.

Mr. FOSS. I only serve my purpose when I call the attention of the members of the House to the fact that these cards are not to be taken seriously. I feel that it is my duty as chairman of this committee to lay before the House all the information which I possess, in order that they may intelligently vote upon these questions, because I realize that in the multiplicity of the business which falls upon every member of the House he has not the time to study and investigate and ferret out all of these questions. I believe that he looks to the chairman of a committee and to the members of a committee standing as representatives of the great naval establishment of our country to point out any defects which may appear in publication which may have a tendency to influence the members of the House, sent here, as these have been, week in and week out. I consider that it is his bounden duty not to withhold a single bit of information that would enlighten them and upon which it is necessary for them to have some understanding in order to vote intelligently. Now, gentlemen, I will not pursue this question further. So far as these cards are concerned, I think, in view of the fact that there are so many misstatements in them, they have not done the cause of building ships in navy-yards one bit of good whatever.

Now, mind you, there has been another movement, and that is on the part of the labor unions of the country. They have sent resolutions and petitions here, and similar petitions have come also from the old soldiers to the members of this House, requesting the House to put a provision in the bill providing for the building of one or more ships in Government navy-yards. They have the sacred right of petition. I put them entirely upon a different footing than I do these gentlemen who send out these cards with a misstatement of the facts. They have made an appeal along correct lines. They have had a hearing before the Naval Committee. We have considered their case, and I do not put them in the same category as the Valjejo Chamber of Commerce, which has been sending out these cards, which, according to our naval authorities, who are the best judges, contain a perversion of facts and figures.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I stand here for every provision in this bill, including that one making it mandatory upon the Secretary of the Navy to build at least one ship in a Government navy-yard, because I think it is a good experiment to try.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. He can build them all there, can he not?

Mr. FOSS. It is within his discretion to build them all there, but he must build one. The committee so decided it. It was not my judgment, but the committee having so decided it, and standing here as the representative of the committee, I am for the provision. Let there be no question about that. [Applause.] But when I say I am for this provision I propose to tell you, for it is only just that I should tell you, why we have heretofore been opposed to building ships in Government navy-yards. In the first place, we have tried the experiment. We have built in Government navy-yards the *Maine*, the *Texas*, the *Raleigh*, and the *Cincinnati*. Two were built in the New York Navy-Yard and two in the Norfolk Navy-Yard. The vessels were begun, according to Admiral Bowles's testimony, in 1888 to 1890, and he says:

I will compare them with the cost of vessels that were begun about the same time. We have not their exact counterparts in the service anywhere, but it is fair to compare the *Maine* and the *Texas* with the *Indiana*, which was begun in 1891, and was the first of the modern battle ships.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Is the *Indiana* larger than either the *Maine* or the *Texas*?

Mr. BOWLES. Yes; the *Indiana* is rated at 10,288 tons and the *Texas* at 6,300, while the *Maine* is rated at 6,600 tons. The *Maine* cost somewhat more than the *Texas*, and I am going to take the *Texas* and the *Raleigh*, which we

built at Norfolk, for comparison, because I think it is a little more fair. The *Texas* was begun June 1, 1889, and she was commissioned in August, 1895. She was under construction, therefore, for six years. The *Indiana* was begun in May, 1891, and commissioned in November, 1895. She was under construction four years. The cost of the *Texas* for hull and machinery was \$2,950,000 approximately—almost \$3,000,000. The contract price for the *Indiana* for hull and machinery was \$3,063,000. That is the comparison that you usually hear, and people will tell you that a 6,000-ton ship built in the navy-yard costs as much as a 10,000-ton battle ship built outside.

Mr. VANDIVER. May I ask the chairman a question?

Mr. FOSS. Wait until I get through with this, if you will. I do not mean to be discourteous.

Mr. VANDIVER. Certainly; neither do I.

Mr. FOSS (continuing the reading):

Taking the cost per ton of hull and machinery, of course, the *Texas* runs up to \$820 a ton, and in the *Indiana* it is \$538 a ton; so that the *Texas*, on that basis of comparison, costs 52 per cent per ton of the hull and machinery more than the *Indiana*.

Mr. VANDIVER. Just at that point.

Mr. FOSS (continuing). Then he goes on and makes a statement of the total cost of shipbuilding, after putting on the armor and the armament, showing that—

The cost of the *Indiana* on that basis was approximately \$6,000,000, and the cost of the *Texas* was \$4,200,000. The cost of the *Texas* per ton was \$519, and the cost of the *Indiana* per ton, completed, was \$669, so that the *Texas* cost more than the *Indiana* by 22.4 per cent per ton.

That was on the completed ship. Then also on the cost of the *Minneapolis* and the *Raleigh* he makes a comparison showing that on the hull and machinery alone it cost 70 per cent more to build the ship per ton in Government navy-yards than in private yards—that is, simply on the hull and machinery.

Mr. VANDIVER. Now, if the gentleman will allow me?

Mr. MAYNARD. Is it not a fact that Constructor Bowles in that testimony says that in the construction of the *Texas* and the *Raleigh* and the *Maine* and *Cincinnati* that certain materials and tools were bought that were not consumed in the construction of the ships, but were charged to the ships; and would not that increase the relative cost?

Mr. FOSS. I think they spent in the neighborhood of \$125,000 to put the navy-yard in a little better shape.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question for information?

Mr. FOSS. Certainly.

Mr. HULL. The *Indiana* is not quite double, but over one-third larger than the *Maine* and the *Texas*?

Mr. FOSS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HULL. Is there an advantage in the cost per ton of building a large ship over the cost per ton of building a small ship? In other words, take two ships, one of 10,500 tons and one of 6,500 tons; would it not cost less per ton to build the 10,500-ton ship than the 6,500 ton? I want to ask that information only.

Mr. FOSS. I do not know that I can state positively about that.

Mr. VANDIVER. Now, will the chairman yield to me for a question? I could not quite distinctly hear all that he was reading. Was the report that you were reading from a part of the hearing of Constructor Bowles?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. VANDIVER. At what time?

Mr. FOSS. This was in our hearings of the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress.

Mr. VANDIVER. A further question: Did not Constructor Bowles in that same hearing also explain why it was that a ship constructed in the navy-yard costs more than a ship constructed in the private yards, and did he not give it as his opinion at that time that the Government ought to build ships in the navy-yards?

Mr. FOSS. Admiral Bowles at that time thought the Government ought to build some ships in the navy-yards.

Mr. VANDIVER. That is the fact, and I think it ought to be brought out.

Mr. FOSS. It is true that the naval constructors are generally in favor of building ships in the navy-yards. It is their profession, it is their business, just as lawyers are in favor of trying cases, just as doctors desire patients, just as one professional or another is ambitious and is desirous to pursue his calling. I believe that universally the naval constructors are in favor of building ships, although Admiral Bowles said this. His latest testimony upon this point is that it will cost the Government 25 per cent more to build ships in Government navy-yards than under private contract.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the agreement reached just prior to the House going into Committee of the Whole that to-day should be devoted to general debate, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Louisiana, and under that arrangement, assuming that the committee will rise at 5 o'clock, the gentleman from Illinois has used one half of the time.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am content to concede all the time that my colleague requires to conclude his remarks.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question.

Mr. FOSS. Very well.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I have great respect for the gentleman from Illinois, and would like to know whether it is his opinion that it is to the advantage of the Government in letting its contracts for new ships to have yards in which may be constructed vessels independently of private contract.

Mr. FOSS. I think it is well for the Government to have a few yards where, in case of necessity—in case of war—they could construct ships. But I think it would be a very extravagant policy to fit up all the navy-yards for the construction of ships.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. May we not get better figures in private contracts by reason of the fact that we are competent and prepared to build ships ourselves?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; probably so.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I think it ought to in a matter of so great importance.

Mr. FOSS. Now, the reasons urged by those who contend that the Government can not build ships in the navy-yards cheaper than in private yards are these: First, I have shown by our experience that we have not been able to do it in the past. But gentlemen make the argument on the other side that the navy-yards were not in as good condition then as at the present time, and I concede to them that fact. If gentlemen will only stop to consider this question for a moment, they will see for themselves why it is that the navy-yards can not build ships as cheaply as they can be built under private contract. Take, for instance, the hours of labor. They work eight hours only in the navy-yards and nine and ten hours in the private yards. There is a difference of 20 per cent in the hours of labor.

Now, there is a difference in the amount of wages. Admiral Bowles says in his testimony, and it stands here uncontradicted, that we pay the laboring men in the navy-yards 30 or 40 per cent more than in private yards.

Mr. METCALF. Let me ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that under the rules of the Navy Department they are to pay in navy-yards of the country exactly the same wages as are paid in the same trades in the immediate vicinity, and is not that a rule rigidly enforced? I know it is as far as my part of the country is concerned, and that they are often paid less than they are paid in other branches in the same vicinity.

Mr. FOSS. Well, that is the statement of Admiral Bowles in his testimony before the committee, and the gentleman can read it for himself.

Mr. METCALF. I call the gentleman's attention to the rule of the Department.

Mr. FOSS. I will yield to my colleague Mr. WATSON, who sits here, to read the testimony of Admiral Bowles.

Mr. WATSON. The Chairman asked the question of Admiral Bowles: How much more are the men getting in the navy-yards than in private yards? Admiral Bowles answered:

Comparing the wages of the navy-yard in Brooklyn and New York with the shipbuilding concerns of the Delaware, I imagine they are getting 35 to 40 per cent more.

The CHAIRMAN. More wages?

Admiral BOWLES. Yes.

That is a fact, and I know of no ruling in the Navy Department to the contrary.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the wages paid in the Brooklyn Navy-Yard are the average wages paid to a mechanic in the same branches in the immediate vicinity, and that is the course pursued throughout the country.

Mr. FOSS. Now, Mr. Chairman, just a word further. I do not care to be interrupted, as I would like to finish my remarks this afternoon, so that the other side can go on. I have pointed out as one reason the difference in the hours of labor, eight to ten, and I have pointed out another reason for the difference in the cost, and that is 30 to 40 per cent more wages paid in the navy-yards than in the private yards. Now, I will point out another reason, and that is in private yards I think you will find they work by the piece and in the Government yards they work by the day.

Then there is another reason why they can not build as cheaply in the Government yards, and that is, we give our employees in the navy-yards every holiday and pay them for it. Not only that, but we give them two weeks' leave of absence and pay them for that. There is another reason which enters into it, and that is, the Government can not buy material as cheaply as a private contractor. It can not go into the open market and buy material. It has no large sum of money by which it can take advantage of the market rates and provide for the future when materials are low in price. It has to buy from time to time, and has usually paid pretty good rates for everything it wanted.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman believe that private yards set aside large sums to buy material when material is low?

Mr. FOSS. They always have ready capital to do it with, and the Congress of the United States does not appropriate any more money for a department than it is obliged to. It never has any ready capital.

Mr. WHEELER. As bearing somewhat on this question, I wish to ask the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] to the following provision, in lines 7 to 11, on page 73 of the bill:

The contract for the construction of each of said vessels so contracted for shall be awarded by the Secretary of the Navy to the lowest best responsible bidder, having in view the best results and most expeditious delivery, and not more than two of said battle ships and armored cruisers and not more than one of said gunboats herein provided for shall be built by one contracting party.

Is that a usual provision in bills of this character?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; I think the usual provision.

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman will remember that this particular language was not submitted to the committee; it was submitted to the gentleman from Ohio to lick into shape. I have therefore asked whether that provision is usual.

Mr. FOSS. That, I think, is the usual provision. I think the gentleman will find it substantially in every naval appropriation bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have pointed out some of the reasons why, in my judgment, the Government yards can not build ships as cheaply as the private yards. I will rehearse those reasons:

First, the difference in the hours of labor; second, the difference in wages; third, the loss of time in Government yards by holidays and by leaves of absence; fourth, impossibility of the Government buying material as cheaply as the private contractors; fifth, much of the work in the private yards is piecework, while in the Government yards work is done by the day.

But there are some other considerations that enter into this question. Suppose that the Government builds a ship as cheaply as the private contractor; but suppose that ship does not come up to the requirements as to speed, what are you going to do about it? The Government has built the ship, has paid for its construction, but there is no guaranty that the vessel shall be equal to the requirements of the Government. Where a ship is built under contract, there is an absolute guaranty on the part of the contractor, and if the ship does not fulfill the stipulations of the contract the Government says: "Away with your ship!" That is an important item to be taken into consideration.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. On that point let me ask the gentleman this question: Has the Government within the last ten years ever refused to accept any ship from any private contractor because it did not come up to the contract, either in speed or otherwise?

Mr. FOSS. I do not know that such has been the fact. But I think the Government has called upon the contractor to make good his contract or has insisted upon deductions from the contract price in case of any failure to conform to the requirements of the contract.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And has not Congress universally remitted such penalties?

Mr. COOMBS. As to cases where the Government has made deductions from the contract price because the contractor has failed to complete the vessel in accordance with the contract, is there not in this bill a provision for a refund in such cases of the money withheld by the Government?

Mr. FOSS. No. I would be glad if the gentleman would point out any such provision.

Mr. COOMBS. I thought there was such a provision. I presume I am mistaken.

Mr. RIXEY. Is it not the fact that the contractors for the torpedo-boat destroyers now claim that they have lost money upon that contract and have applied to the Navy Department to bear a portion of that loss, and has not the Navy Department recommended to Congress that the Government bear one-half the loss?

Mr. FOSS. I think that is true; but that matter has never been considered yet by our committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just a few words, in conclusion, in reference to this subject. I may say here, if gentlemen will not regard it as too personal to myself, that I made some study, not only in this country but abroad, of the building of ships in private yards and in Government yards. Some two years ago I visited all the great private yards of England and some of the other countries, and I visited also the Government navy-yards. I looked very carefully into the question of the comparative cost of building ships in Government yards and in private yards.

Up to 1896 there was no question that in England it cost more to build ships in Government yards than in private yards. From 1896 down, by reason of the fact that they have been perfecting their navy-yards, they have got to the point where the cost is about the same. Sometimes they will build a battle ship in a private yard which will cost more than a similar ship built in a government yard, and sometimes the reverse will happen.

But mark you the difference in conditions between foreign yards and our yards. In England the hours of labor in Government yards are the same as in private yards. Here the difference in hours of labor is as 8 to 10. The wages are about the same. In England the conditions of labor in Government yards and in private yards are practically on the same footing.

That is the experience, too, I think, in France and also, I was about to say, in Germany. No, not in Germany. The information which I obtained on this subject when in Germany has been confirmed recently by the German secretary of the navy or minister of marine, with whom, when he was here a few months ago, I discussed this question. The experience in Germany to-day as to the comparative cost of building ships in private yards and in Government yards is that it costs from 10 per cent to 25 per cent more to build ships in Government yards than to construct them under private contract. And the other day when I made inquiry on this subject from one of the naval authorities of Russia, I was told that practically the same thing existed in that country.

And, mark you, in Germany they pay less to their men in Government yards than in private yards; and so they do in Russia; whereas in our own country the Government yards pay 30 or 40 per cent more. Besides, we give them leaves of absence, and give them two hours each day additional. Do you mean to say that if in foreign countries they can not build them as cheaply as under private contract when conditions are equal, we in our own country, where the conditions are unequal, can build them as cheaply as under private contract?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Just a moment. Why do they build and continue to build them in Government yards?

Mr. FOSS. Oh, that is a question of policy.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Is not the reason because it gives competition all the time, if they have the private yard and the Government yard?

Mr. FOSS. It may be that. It may be that their systems of government over there are more paternal than ours. It may be that here in this country we give scope to individual inventive genius, whereas over there it may be perchance their purpose to stifle it. Here we exalt the individual; there, the state. It may lie in the very foundation and construction of government, but I want to say to you, gentlemen, I have gone into a very careful consideration of the whole question, and I thought I ought in duty to you to present it carefully before you, so that you may get the result of what study and investigation a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs has made.

I want to say to you, however, that I do not believe we will be able to settle this question notwithstanding our past experience, although we have before us the light which comes from foreign countries, although we have all of the facts which may come from research and from study, I say I do not believe that we can settle this question which now vexes many minds unless we try the experiment of building at least one ship in a Government navy-yard. I may say that the Government navy-yards have plenty of employment for their labor to-day. The repair work which comes from the ships is enough to keep the men employed, and as we build up our Navy of course there will be more repair work to do. If you build a ship in a Government navy-yard, it will mean that you will have to take on perhaps a thousand or two thousand more men to build that ship, and after they become nicely settled in their homes—Vallejo, or in some other city dependent on Government work—then they will come and insist that you keep up the building of ships. Why? Because you attracted them there with the promise of Government work, and you can not go back on them then.

Now, there are all these questions to be taken into consideration; but I say to you, let us try the experiment. Let us settle the question so, notwithstanding the fact that I have presented a side of this question which may seem to be antagonistic to the proposition contended for in the bill, I felt that possibly nobody would say anything upon it unless I did, and I thought it was due to every member of the House to know both sides, because only after they knew both sides could they intelligently vote for it. But let no member of this committee or House think for one single moment that I do not stand here advocating the provision, because I think it is a wise provision to build at least one ship in a Government navy-yard, not only to solve for the country the question as to whether or not we have been paying exorbitant prices for our ships, but also to get some definite data before the country as to the relative cost of building them as a guidance for the future policy of the construction of the American Navy.

Gentlemen, I thank you for having listened to me as long as you have. I feel very much interested in this subject of build-

ing up the American Navy. I believe it is a wise policy. We must have a navy that is strong enough to maintain the honor of our country whenever and wherever that honor is assailed; we must have a navy strong enough to preserve our commerce and our merchant marine; we must have a navy strong enough also to stand back of the foreign policy of our Government and see to it that American rights are forever protected everywhere under the blue canopy of the sky. Because I am for the Navy, because I am for the construction of these mighty battle ships, because I am for all these things, it is my purpose and ambition to see to it that while they cost so much money, while they take out of the pockets of the people millions and millions of dollars, that it shall not ever be said or charged against the Naval Committee on the floor of the American Congress or anywhere else that one single dollar was ever extravagantly appropriated or did not go as far as it was possible to send it, but that in all our appropriations for the maintenance of this mighty naval establishment we have been economical, we have been wise, we have been judicious, and we have always had before our eyes the interests of the American people and of the American Republic. [Prolonged applause.]

APPENDIX.

[House Report No. 1792, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred so much of the President's annual message as relates to the naval establishment, together with the annual estimates of the Navy Department, submit herewith a bill (H. R. 14945) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, with the following statement:

The amount carried by this bill is \$77,659,386.63. Total estimates of the Department amounted to \$98,910,984.63, to which were added supplemental estimates to the amount of \$1,153,700 and additional estimates to the amount of \$5,000,000. The committee, after the most careful investigation of all of these estimates, having in view a careful and judicious expenditure of public money without in any way injuring the efficiency of the naval service, made deductions to the amount of \$27,405,298. This bill, as above stated, carries \$77,659,386.63, which is a decrease of appropriations over the naval appropriation act of last year of \$442,404.37.

The following table gives a comparative statement of the estimates of this year, the amounts appropriated last year, and the amounts embodied in this bill for the several bureaus and departments of the naval establishment:

Comparative statement.

Naval establishment.	Appropriated, 1902.	Carried by bill.	Estimates, 1903.
Pay of the Navy	\$15,200,284.00	\$16,138,199.00	\$16,498,199.00
Pay, miscellaneous	600,000.00	600,000.00	600,000.00
Contingent, Navy	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00
Emergency fund	250,000.00	100,000.00	300,000.00
Bureau of Navigation	696,625.00	1,289,671.25	988,271.25
Bureau of Ordnance	2,583,455.75	3,109,006.75	3,444,706.75
Bureau of Equipment	4,014,802.52	5,306,202.52	5,018,002.52
Bureau of Yards and Docks	654,879.08	742,214.08	784,204.08
Public works—Bureau of Yards and Docks	6,775,010.00	6,561,075.00	20,781,375.00
Public works—Bureau of Navigation:			
Naval Academy	3,000,000.00	500,000.00	1,500,000.00
Naval training station, Port Royal			159,750.00
Naval training station, California	6,000.00	31,500.00	31,500.00
Naval training station, Rhode Island	52,170.00	114,280.00	114,280.00
Naval War College		60,000.00	60,000.00
Public works—Bureau of Ordnance	318,100.00	382,200.00	1,457,300.00
Public works—Bureau of Equipment:			
Depots for coal	750,000.00		640,000.00
Defenses for insular naval stations and coal depots			500,000.00
Naval Observatory	10,000.00	5,000.00	27,890.00
Hydrographic Office			230,000.00
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	210,000.00	280,000.00	245,000.00
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	3,543,849.28	3,808,932.28	4,367,590.28
Bureau of Construction and Repair	7,380,824.25	8,585,824.25	9,925,824.25
Bureau of Steam Engineering	3,462,900.00	3,983,900.00	4,280,000.00
Naval Academy	227,115.45	229,905.77	243,705.77
Marine Corps	2,798,520.27	2,988,465.73	2,993,465.73
Increase of Navy:			
Construction and machinery	21,000,000.00	13,303,010.00	17,303,010.00
Armor and armament	4,000,000.00	9,000,000.00	6,000,000.00
Equipment	400,000.00	400,000.00	400,000.00
Equipping a navy-yard to build ships		175,000.00	
To reimburse water fund, naval training station, California	6,459.32		
Blythe Island	2,000.00		
Naval Observatory	149,571.08		
Naval Observatory, visitors' expenses	2,000.00		
Ericsson, remit time penalties	17,225.00		
Grand total	78,101,791.00	77,659,386.63	98,910,984.63

PAY OF THE NAVY.

Pay of the Navy	\$15,200,284.00	\$16,138,199.00	\$16,498,199.00
Pay, miscellaneous	600,000.00	600,000.00	600,000.00
Contingent, Navy	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00
Emergency	250,000.00	100,000.00	300,000.00
Total	16,060,284.00	16,848,199.00	17,408,199.00

Pay of the Navy in this bill is \$16,138,199, which is made up from the following table:

Pay of 2,014 officers on the active list	\$4,667,166
Commutation of quarters for officers	200,000
Pay of 372 naval cadets under instruction	186,000
Pay of 573 officers on the retired list	1,357,321
Pay of 137 clerks	207,000
Pay of 25,500 petty officers, seamen, and other enlisted men	8,820,000
Pay of 2,500 apprentice boys at training stations and on board training ships	450,000
Pay of enlisted men on the retired list	50,202
Extra pay of petty officers and seamen reenlisting under honorable discharge	184,450
To pay interest on deposits by enlisted men, act February 9, 1889	16,000
Total	16,138,199

This is an increase of \$967,915 over the appropriation for the same object last year, and is accounted for by the increased number of officers on the active list and the 3,000 additional men recommended by the committee for properly manning the new ships of the Navy.

Under "Pay, miscellaneous," the appropriation proposed in this bill is the same as that in the law of last year, but the emergency fund has been reduced to \$100,000.

There is a proviso attached to the emergency fund which will permit civilian employees performing duty at insular naval stations to be paid out of this fund until Congress shall make specific appropriation for them.

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION.

This Bureau has general jurisdiction over the officers and men of the Navy, their training and assignment; also the movement of vessels in the Navy and their complement of officers and men. It has charge of the compilation of the Naval Register and preparation, revision, and enforcement of all tactics, drill books, signal codes, cipher codes, and the uniform regulations. It also has general supervision of the Naval Academy and technical school for officers (except the War College and torpedo school).

The following is a statement of the estimates of the Bureau for the fiscal year 1903, with the appropriations carried by this bill and the appropriations for the current fiscal year:

Bureau of Navigation.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill, 1903.	Appropriated, 1902.
Transporting, recruiting, and contingent	\$275,000.00	\$275,000.00	\$180,000.00
Gunnery exercises	12,000.00	12,000.00	12,000.00
Outfits for naval apprentices	117,000.00	117,000.00	117,000.00
Outfits for landmen	225,000.00	225,000.00	225,000.00
Outfits on first enlistment	135,000.00	135,000.00	135,000.00
Maintenance of colliers (under equipment last year)	350,000.00	350,000.00	350,000.00
Naval training station, California	30,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00
Naval training station, Rhode Island	56,600.00	55,000.00	45,000.00
Naval training station, Port Royal S. C.	45,000.00		
Naval War College, Rhode Island	14,246.25	14,246.25	11,200.00
Naval Home, Philadelphia	76,425.00	76,425.00	76,425.00
Total	1,336,271.25	1,289,671.25	1,046,625.00

As will be seen from the above table there is an increase in appropriations over that of last year amounting to \$243,046.25. This is made up in two ways. First, by the increase in the appropriation for transportation and recruiting of men in consequence of the increase in the personnel, and, secondly, by the recommendation of the committee of an appropriation of \$135,000 for outfits for men on their first enlistment. It is believed by your committee that the expenditure of this amount will bring into the Navy a better class of men and at the same time insure fewer desertions.

There is a provision made in the bill for the appointment of a board of naval officers by the Secretary of the Navy to recommend a suitable site for a naval training station at some point on the Great Lakes, and having recommended such a site to estimate its value and ascertain the cost of its purchase and make a full and detailed report to Congress.

It is believed that the establishment of a naval training station on the lakes will have the effect of drawing into our Navy a great many strong and sturdy young men from the fields and farms of the Middle West who will make excellent seamen. It has frequently been said that our best men of to-day come from the interior, and more from that section of the country than all other sections combined.

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE.

This Bureau has general charge of the ordnance of the Navy and the armor and armament of vessels, the torpedo station and magazines on shore, and designs the interior arrangements of all buildings erected for its use at navy-yards, as well as the machinery used for handling ammunition on ship, the interior of the turrets and the arrangement of guns, and the distribution of armor thereon. All torpedoes, powder, guns, and war explosives of all kinds, and armor plate, are bought and manufactured under its supervision. It has control of all details of its own administration.

The following table gives the estimates for the next fiscal year and the amount carried by this bill and the amount appropriated last year:

Bureau of Ordnance.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill, 1903.	Appropriated, 1902.
Ordnance and ordnance stores	\$800,000.00	\$800,000.00	\$500,000.00
Reserve supply ammunition	500,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00
Conversion of guns	25,000.00	25,000.00	25,000.00
Purchase and manufacture smokeless powder	500,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00
Battery for Newark	175,000.00	175,000.00	
Batteries for New Orleans and Albany	200,000.00	200,000.00	
Cranes, Portsmouth	10,000.00		
Machine tools, Boston	5,000.00		
Cranes, Boston	11,000.00		
Equipment storehouse, New York		11,000.00	
Machinery, proposed gun factory, Washington	50,000.00		100,000.00

Bureau of Ordnance—Continued.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill, 1903.	Appropriated, 1902.
Steel-casting plant, Washington	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	
Chemical laboratory	5,000.00	5,000.00	
Machine tools, Pensacola	12,000.00	12,000.00	
Machine tools, Puget Sound	50,000.00	50,000.00	
Cranes, Puget Sound	10,000.00		
Machinery, Washington	50,000.00	50,000.00	\$53,000.00
Coal machinery			9,849.00
Equipment forge shop, gun factory			40,000.00
Tools, Mare Island			24,000.00
New batteries, Baltimore			175,000.00
Reserve guns for auxiliary cruisers	250,000.00	250,000.00	250,000.00
Reserve guns for ships of Navy	500,000.00	250,000.00	
Torpedo station, Newport	65,000.00	65,000.00	65,000.00
Armory and equipment, Naval Militia	60,000.00	60,000.00	60,000.00
Arms and equipment of Marine Corps			100,000.00
Naval proving ground			25,000.00
Naval station, Puget Sound			18,000.00
Repairs	30,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00
Miscellaneous items	75,000.00	75,000.00	75,000.00
Civil establishments	41,706.75	41,006.75	36,606.75
Total	3,444,706.75	3,109,006.75	2,533,455.75

It will be seen from the above table that there is an increase in the amount of appropriations for this Bureau over that of last year of \$525,551. This is due to an increase in the appropriation for ordnance and ordnance stores and for target practice of \$300,000 over that of the previous year. Last year the appropriation was not enough, and consequently the Department has had to ask for a deficiency appropriation of \$300,000 to carry on the work of the Bureau. The importance of target practice can not be overestimated. We may have ships and we may have men, but if the men are not trained by constant target practice to use the guns on our ships, then, in the stress of war, we will, when perchance too late, realize our weakness. The one thing which so marked the superiority of our men over that of the Spaniards in the recent war was their gunnery. Admiral O'Neil estimates that the total cost of target practice for all vessels of the Navy per annum is nearly \$900,000, or, allowing for a certain number of vessels out of commission, approximately \$750,000, and yet the amount allowed is not nearly as great as that allowed in some of the foreign navies.

The next important item in this Bureau, showing an increase over that of last year, is an appropriation of \$175,000 for a new and improved battery for the *Newark*, a cruiser built in 1890, which has an antiquated battery and one by no means equal in efficiency to the later types. It is recommended that she be given a new battery, and also an appropriation of \$200,000 is recommended for new and improved batteries for the *New Orleans* and the *Albany*, two vessels built in England for Brazil, but purchased at the outbreak of the Spanish war by the United States. The batteries on these vessels differ from those used on our own, requiring special ammunition, and it is a source of great inconvenience to keep them supplied. It is believed by the Department that they should carry the standard United States Navy guns.

The next new and important item in this Bureau is that of \$250,000 for the purchase and manufacture of reserve guns for the ships of the Navy. It is believed that we should have a number of guns constantly in reserve in case of accident to replace those which will have to be repaired from time to time. The other items under this Bureau—the reserve supply of ammunition and purchase of smokeless powder and reserve guns for auxiliary cruisers, maintenance of the torpedo stations, the arming and equipping of the Naval Militia, repairs, miscellaneous, and civil establishment—are the same in the amount of appropriation as those of last year.

BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT.

The duties of this Bureau consist in furnishing the coal and general equipment of vessels. It also has charge of the manufacture of rope, anchors, cables, rigging, sails, galleys, and cooking utensils, and a portion of the electrical machinery for ships; also of the Naval Observatory, Nautical Almanac, and compass offices, and all details of its own administration.

The following table shows the estimates, the amount of appropriation proposed in the bill, and amount carried by the last appropriation act:

Bureau of Equipment.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill, 1903.	Appropriated, 1902.
Coal and transportation	\$2,500,000.00	\$2,500,000.00	\$2,000,000.00
Equipment of vessels	2,000,000.00	2,000,000.00	1,500,000.00
Ocean and lake surveys	100,000.00	100,000.00	100,000.00
Depots for coal			750,000.00
Maintenance for colliers, 1900, under navigation	350,000.00		350,000.00
Contingent	35,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00
Civil establishment	38,002.52	31,202.52	29,802.52
Total	5,018,002.52	5,306,202.52	4,764,802.52

It will be seen from the above that there is an increase of \$541,400 over that provided for last year. The increase in the appropriation recommended this year under this Bureau is due practically to two items, the first being that for coal and transportation of \$2,500,000, which is an increase over that of last year of \$500,000. In the urgent deficiency bill of this year an appropriation of \$800,000 was asked for in order to provide fully for our ships. During the last fiscal year the Bureau of Equipment purchased 324,168 tons of coal, costing \$2,273,111.81.

There is an increase in the next item of equipment of vessels of \$500,000, due to the necessities of an enlarged Navy. A deficiency of \$450,000 in the bill was asked for this year in addition to that of \$1,500,000 appropriated last year. It will be seen that the item for coal depots has been reduced \$110,000. The other items under this Bureau are practically the same as last year.

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS.

This is the civil engineering bureau of the Department, and has charge of the construction of buildings and their maintenance in the several navy-yards, also of all docks and shore structures of all kinds, such as quay walls, wharves, etc., for which it estimates. It also has charge of all topographical improvements in such yards: Newport, R. I., Annapolis, Md., and the Naval

Home, Philadelphia, the magazines and hospitals outside of navy-yards and the buildings for which it does not estimate being excepted from its jurisdiction. The part of the naval appropriation bill under public works is estimated by this Bureau.

The following table shows the estimates for the fiscal year 1903, the proposed appropriation in this bill, and the amount carried by the last appropriation act:

Bureau of Yards and Docks.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropriated, 1902.
Maintenance of yards and docks.....	\$800,000.00	\$800,000.00	\$500,000.00
Contingent.....	50,000.00	40,000.00	50,000.00
Civil establishment.....	134,204.08	102,214.08	104,879.08
Total	784,204.08	742,214.08	654,879.08

As will be seen, there is an increase of \$90,000 in this Bureau over the act of last year. Practically all of this is due to the necessity for increased number of employees in consequence of the action of Congress in giving two weeks' leave of absence to employees in the navy-yards. The item for contingent expenses has been reduced \$10,000.

PUBLIC WORKS.

The following table shows the estimates for 1903, the amounts carried by this bill, and those appropriated for the present fiscal year:

Bureau of Yards and Docks.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropriated, 1902.
Portsmouth.....	\$1,947,575	\$672,075	\$364,850
Boston.....	1,570,200	702,700	551,000
Narragansett.....	200,000
New London.....	51,000	41,000
New York.....	3,475,000	499,000	1,009,000
League Island.....	741,300	447,300	695,230
Washington.....	622,000	240,000	318,210
Norfolk.....	1,511,000	344,000	594,220
Key West.....	93,000	93,000	144,000
Mare Island.....	888,700	225,500	331,690
Puget Sound.....	1,169,500	748,500	273,000
Porto Rico.....	2,613,000	50,000	40,000
Pensacola.....	965,800	2,500	41,500
New Orleans.....	359,000	339,000	330,000
Dry Tortugas.....	100,000
Four dry docks.....	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,000,000
Hawaii.....	107,300
Tutula.....	108,000	93,000	225,000
Charleston.....	1,050,000	250,000	150,000
Repairs and preservation of yards.....	500,000	500,000	500,000
Cavite.....	381,000	233,500
Olongapo.....	1,443,000
Guam.....	12,300
Plans.....	30,000
Total	20,781,375	6,561,075	6,775,010

The estimates call for the sum of \$20,781,375. Your committee after most careful investigation of the above items reduced them \$14,220,300, leaving \$6,561,075, which it recommends for public improvements in our yards and stations during the present year. Heretofore Congress has authorized the construction of many new buildings at our different stations, and it is thought advisable this year to complete these first before entering upon new constructions, and this is the policy which has been carried into effect except in a few yards, notably that of Algiers, which is a new naval station and requires the building of some shops, and also at Puget Sound, which is also comparatively a new station and is growing rapidly in importance. The estimates were sent in by the Department for a naval station at San Juan, P. R., to the amount of \$2,613,000, but the committee thought it would be wise not to provide for any naval station in the West Indies until they had more definite knowledge as to the best location for one.

Estimates for a naval station at Olongapo, P. I., to the amount of \$1,443,000, were also cut out for practically the same reason. It is believed for the present we can get along with the old Spanish naval station at Cavite, and accordingly the committee has made some recommendations for that station, notably \$200,000, toward the purchase of a steel floating dock, which can be used there or wherever it may hereafter be deemed advisable to build a navy-yard. Estimates for housing and storing torpedo vessels at Boston, to cost \$550,000; at New York, to cost the same; at Charleston, S. C., the same; at Pensacola, to cost \$650,000; at Mare Island, to cost \$125,000, and other items, such as the purchase of land at New York, \$2,000,000; at Norfolk, \$350,000; barracks for enlisted men, to cost, in all, at New York, \$500,000; at League Island, \$350,000; at Mare Island, \$350,000; and storehouses to be established at the different navy-yards, costing anywhere from \$150,000 to \$600,000, were all of them considered by the committee as matters which might be delayed for further consideration without in any way injuring the efficiency of the naval service.

Under this Bureau the committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,050,000 for the completion of the four dry docks at Portsmouth, Boston, League Island, and Mare Island, which are now in process of construction.

It may be of interest to members of the House to know the value of the real estate, chattels, and machinery plants at the various yards and stations, and accordingly the following table is inserted:

Statement showing the value of real estate and chattels and machinery plant at the several navy-yards and stations, June 30, 1901.

Navy-yard and stations.	Real estate and chattels.	Machinery plants.
Navy-yard, Portsmouth, N. H.....	\$3,070,842.05	\$473,896.69
Navy-yard, Boston, Mass.....	12,712,149.23	844,925.85
Naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I.....	245,173.07	59,746.83
Naval training station, Newport, R. I.....	496,804.57	11,006.97
Naval War College, Newport, R. I.....	101,061.66
Naval station, New London, Conn.....	278,992.38	735.00
Navy-yard, New York.....	21,906,010.37	1,488,374.99
Navy-yard, League Island, Pa.....	3,562,722.56	325,802.68

Statement showing the value of real estate, chattels, etc.—Continued.

Navy-yard and stations.	Real estate and chattels.	Machinery plants.
Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.....	\$1,260,164.11	\$23,150.55
Naval Observatory, Washington, D. C.....	870,291.13
Naval Home, Philadelphia, Pa.....	901,944.45
Navy-yard, Washington, D. C.....	5,087,815.72	2,107,198.52
Marine headquarters, Washington, D. C.....	221,639.83
Naval proving ground, Indian Head, Md.....	597,658.59	76,894.51
Navy-yard, Norfolk, Va.....	6,313,919.67	863,164.57
Naval station, Port Royal, S. C.....	1,079,771.37	70,388.56
Naval station, Key West, Fla.....	851,069.53	48,005.81
Navy-yard, Pensacola, Fla.....	1,781,450.39	134,580.94
Navy-yard, Mare Island, Cal.....	5,387,301.86	660,146.49
Naval training station, San Francisco, Cal.....	642,865.65
Naval station, Puget Sound, Wash.....	941,993.80	255,122.21
Sacketts Harbor, N. Y.....	17,350.00
Naval station, San Juan, P. R.....	202,236.93	7,008.42
Island of Guam.....	50,512.39
Naval station, Cavite, P. I.....	1,645,299.80	128,632.13
Algiers, La.....	662,933.46
Pago Pago, Samoa.....	112,101.55
Japonski Island, Alaska.....	4,378.00
Frenchmans Bay, Maine.....	109,762.47
Honolulu, H. I.....	732,292.12
Pichilingue, Mexico.....	28,491.79
Portsmouth Grove, R. I.....	35,709.00
Yokohama, Japan.....	36,542.71
Total	71,409,162.21	7,559,451.72

PUBLIC WORKS (BUREAU OF NAVIGATION).

The following table gives the estimates for 1903, the amount carried by the bill, and the amount appropriated last year:

Public works, Bureau of Navigation.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropriated, 1902.
Naval Academy.....	\$1,500,000	\$500,000	\$3,000,000
Naval training station, California.....	31,500	31,500	6,000
Naval training station, Rhode Island.....	114,280	114,280	52,170
Naval training station, Port Royal.....	159,750
Naval War College.....	60,000	60,000
Total	1,865,530	705,780	3,058,170

NAVAL ACADEMY.

By act of Congress June 7, 1900, the Secretary of the Navy was authorized to complete plans "covering all contemplated buildings and improvements at the Naval Academy and for each and every purpose connected therewith, which plans shall involve the total expenditure of not more than \$8,000,000." And it was further provided—

"That after the preparation and approval of the plans * * * the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for any part or all of the improvements and buildings herein authorized within said limit of cost, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law."

Accordingly such plans were completed and approved by the Secretary of the Navy on October 3, 1900, and contracts have been let for most of the buildings.

The armory and the boathouse are nearly finished; the contract has been let for cadets' quarters, which will cost \$2,248,000, accommodating 1,200 cadets; the foundations of the marine engineering building are now being constructed; the gymnasium and officers' quarters will be under contract by June 1, as will also be the building known as the officers' mess, and plans for the sea-wall work are now practically completed and will be advertised in a short time.

The following is a statement of the appropriations which have been made for the rebuilding of the Naval Academy:

By act of May 4, 1898.....	\$500,000
By act of March 3, 1899.....	730,000
By act of June 7, 1900.....	350,000
By act of March 3, 1901.....	3,000,000

Total appropriated..... 4,570,000

There has been expended up to date \$1,192,148.11. The payments to be made between now and the 1st of July will bring the expenditures up to \$2,094,934.37, leaving on July 1 an unexpended balance of \$2,500,000. This unexpended balance, with a further appropriation of \$500,000 recommended in this bill, will be necessary to meet the payments due on contracts made and to be made during the coming fiscal year.

There is further provided under the head of "Public works, Bureau of Navigation," improvements and buildings for the naval training station in California, \$31,500, and also some improvements at the training station, Rhode Island, costing \$114,280. Annex to the present building at the Naval War College in Rhode Island to cost \$60,000 has been recommended by the general board as necessary for the performance of the important work of the college where war plans and schemes of campaign and the study of the art of war in its broadest and highest sense are carried on.

PUBLIC WORKS, BUREAU OF ORDNANCE.

The following table shows the estimates of this year, the amount carried by the bill, and the amount appropriated last year:

Public works, Bureau of Ordnance.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill, 1903.	Appropriated, 1902.
Naval magazine, Iona Island.....	\$49,500	\$49,500	\$100,000
Naval magazine, Dover.....	93,800	80,000	65,000
Naval magazine, Fort Mifflin.....	5,000	5,000	56,000
Naval magazine, Norfolk.....	117,500	46,500	60,500
Naval torpedo station, Newport.....	32,000	28,000	25,000
Naval proving ground, Indian Head.....	27,000	23,000	11,600
Naval magazine, Portsmouth.....	400,000

Public works, Bureau of Ordnance—Continued.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill, 1903.	Appropri- ated, 1902.
Naval magazine, Boston	\$500,000	-----	-----
Naval shell house, Chelsea	8,000	-----	-----
Naval quarters, Rose Island	5,200	\$5,200	-----
Naval magazine, Fort Lafayette	35,000	25,000	-----
Water system, Fort Norfolk	2,000	-----	-----
St. Helena, Norfolk	2,300	-----	-----
Naval magazine, Man Island	80,000	80,000	-----
Naval magazine, Puget Sound	100,000	50,000	-----
Total	1,457,300	392,200	\$318,100

It will be seen that there is a slight increase over that appropriated last year of \$74,100. Some improvements are asked for at the different magazines, as shown in the above table. Among the estimates were recommendations from the Department for a naval magazine at Portsmouth approximately to cost \$400,000, and Boston \$500,000; but in view of the fact that these two navy-yards are within short distances of each other, about 40 miles apart, it is thought that possibly one magazine might answer for both, and accordingly the provision authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to appoint a board of naval officers to recommend a site or sites for one naval magazine on the New England coast and to make report to Congress at its next session is placed in this bill.

NAVAL OBSERVATORY.

The appropriation for the maintenance of the grounds and roads of the Naval Observatory which heretofore has been \$10,000 per year is reduced to one-half the amount, \$5,000.

BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY.

The duties of this Bureau are implied in its title, and comprise all that relates to the laboratories, naval hospitals, and dispensaries. It designs various buildings erected within the navy-yards for its own purposes, so far as their internal arrangements are concerned, and has control of the same after completion. It designs, builds, and maintains all buildings erected for its own purposes outside of navy-yards, and, generally, estimates for and controls all the details of its own organization.

The following table shows the estimates of 1903, the amount carried by the bill, and the amount appropriated last year:

Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropri- ated, 1902.
Medical department	\$100,000	\$125,000	\$95,000
Naval hospital fund	40,000	40,000	40,000
Contingent	35,000	35,000	35,000
Repairs	20,000	30,000	20,000
Naval hospital, Rhode Island	-----	-----	20,000
Naval hospital, Canacao	50,000	50,000	-----
Total	245,000	280,000	210,000

It will be seen that there is an increase of \$70,000 in the above table, \$90,000 of which is due to increased necessity for supplies for our officers and men and at our navy-yards and stations. There is recommended an appropriation of \$50,000 for a naval hospital at Canacao, P. I., which is strongly urged by the Bureau.

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS.

Generally speaking, this is the financial bureau of the Department. Its duties comprise all that relates to requiring for or preparing provisions, clothing, small stores, and contingent stores of the Pay Department; the purchase of all supplies for the naval establishment, except medical and surgical appliances, and instruments and supplies for the Marine Corps, and the keeping of a proper system of accounts of the same. Like the other bureaus, it estimates for and controls its own administration.

The following statement shows the estimates, the amount carried by this bill, and the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year:

Supplies and accounts.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropri- ated, 1902.
Provisions, Navy	\$4,000,000.00	\$3,500,000.00	\$3,250,000.00
Contingent	250,000.00	200,000.00	200,000.00
Civil establishment	117,590.00	103,932.28	93,849.28
Total	4,367,590.00	3,803,932.28	3,543,849.28

It will be seen from the above table that the increased appropriations recommended this year over that made last year are \$290,083. The item of provisions for the Navy is increased from \$3,250,000 to \$3,500,000. This is due to the fact that under this bill we are providing for 3,000 additional men, and it will be necessary to provide for their necessities. The item for contingent is the same as that of last year, but there is a small increase of approximately \$10,000 under the civil establishment for the navy-yard at Puget Sound and the naval station at Key West.

NAVY RATION.

Under this Bureau is inserted an amendment to section 1580 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, so as to provide for a new navy ration. The Secretary of the Navy ordered a board to investigate the whole subject and make report, which has been done in a separate communication referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. The present ration has been substantially without change since it was established in July, 1861. The Secretary, in his report, says:

"The board recommends the legislation that will give to the crews of our ships a liberal and proper amount under any and all conditions of service without compelling them to contribute to their own subsistence, as at present. The changes recommended are approved and would make the cost of the ration about 30 cents per man per diem, which is now its nominal commutation value. At present the actual cost of the ration is from 21 to 22 cents."

BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR.

The duties of this Bureau comprise all that relate to the designing, building, fitting, and repairing the hulls of ships, their turrets, spars, capstans,

windlasses, steering gear, and ventilating apparatus, and, in conjunction with the Bureau of Ordnance, designing the construction of ammunition hoists, their shafts, machinery, and appurtenances; placing and securing armor; placing and securing on board ship the armament and its accessories as manufactured and supplied by the Bureau of Ordnance. It has charge of the care and preservation of ships in reserve, the docking of ships, the designing of slips, and the internal arrangement of the various buildings and shops under its control, and estimates for and controls its own administration.

The following table shows the estimates for 1903, the amount carried by this bill, and the amount appropriated for 1902:

Construction and repair.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropri- ated, 1902.
Construction and repair of vessels	\$9,000,000.00	\$8,000,000.00	\$7,000,000.00
Improvements, construction plants:			
Portsmouth	30,000.00	30,000.00	50,000.00
Boston	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
New York	50,000.00	50,000.00	25,000.00
League Island	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
Norfolk	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
Pensacola	-----	-----	15,000.00
Mare Island	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
Puget Sound	75,000.00	75,000.00	30,000.00
New Orleans	15,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00
Charleston	50,000.00	-----	-----
Philippines	50,000.00	50,000.00	-----
Derrick, New York	35,000.00	-----	-----
Derrick, Cavite	45,000.00	-----	-----
Lighters, Mare Island	70,000.00	-----	-----
Four steel tugs	280,000.00	140,000.00	-----
Civil establishment	25,824.25	25,824.25	25,824.25
Total	9,925,824.25	8,585,824.25	7,900,824.25

It will be seen from the above table that there is an increase under this Bureau of \$1,225,000, which is largely made up from the necessity for the increase in the appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the repair of our vessels, which are increasing in number each year. A new item was inserted for \$50,000 for a construction plant at Cavite, P. I., and also an appropriation of \$140,000 for two steel tugs, necessary for the general service of the navy-yards at home stations. The items under the civil establishment of the Bureau are practically the same as those of last year.

BUREAU OF STEAM ENGINEERING.

The duties of this Bureau comprise all that relates to designing, building, fitting out, and repairing the machinery for which steam is the motive power on board ship. Like the other bureaus, it designs the internal arrangement of its various shops at the navy-yard and estimates for and controls its own administration.

The following table shows the estimates for the fiscal year 1903, the amount carried by this bill, and the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year:

Steam engineering.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropri- ated, 1902.
Steam machinery	\$3,450,000	\$3,405,000	\$3,245,000
Contingent	1,000	1,000	1,000
Machine plant:			
Portsmouth	100,000	-----	-----
League Island	130,000	130,000	100,000
Norfolk	25,000	25,000	-----
Mare Island	80,000	80,000	100,000
Puget Sound	125,000	125,000	-----
Building experimental station	400,000	200,000	-----
Civil establishment	23,000	17,900	16,900
Total	4,289,000	3,983,900	3,462,900

The above table shows an increase of appropriations to the amount of \$521,000. As will be seen, there is an increase of \$150,000 in the first item under this Bureau for the completion, repairing, and preservation of machinery and boilers of vessels, etc. There is also an appropriation for the equipment of the new steam engineering shops at League Island, Mare Island, and Puget Sound. An experimental station and testing laboratory for the Bureau of Steam Engineering has been strongly recommended by the Department and the Secretary of the Navy, and after carefully considering the same the committee has inserted an appropriation in this bill for its establishment.

The appropriation of the civil establishment of the Bureau of Steam Engineering is increased only by \$1,000 over that of last year.

NAVAL ACADEMY (CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT).

The following table shows the estimates for 1903, the amount carried by the bill, and the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1902:

Naval Academy.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropri- ated, 1902.
Pay of professors and others	\$68,991.00	\$55,191.00	\$55,191.00
Pay of watchmen, mechanics, and others	46,259.95	46,259.95	44,799.95
Pay of steam employees	11,154.82	11,154.82	7,824.50
Calboats	4,500.00	4,500.00	4,500.00
Repairs	31,000.00	31,000.00	51,000.00
Heating and lighting	20,000.00	20,000.00	20,000.00
Contingent	61,800.00	61,800.00	43,800.00
Total	243,705.77	229,905.77	227,115.45

The amounts of these appropriations are practically the same as those of last year, in some cases there being reductions and in others increases; but the totals are about the same. Under this Bureau an insertion is made for the appointment of 500 additional cadets.

MORE OFFICERS.

Of course everyone must realize that we can not go on building up the matériel of the Navy without at the same time increasing the personnel. If

we build ships, we must also provide for officers and men to man them. The former are absolutely useless without the latter. The Secretary in his report calls special attention to the need of more line officers, and the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation in his report, in which he considers the subject exhaustively, says:

"The ever-increasing need of line officers has made itself felt with augmented force during the past fiscal year. At no time in the history of the Navy has such a condition held as now exists. If the Department were suddenly called upon to man for war service all the vessels available in the navy-yards, it would be confronted with a requirement impossible to meet. It is a fact that there are not enough line officers of the Navy to man the vessels already constructed. This being the case, the Bureau need scarcely call attention to the state of affairs which will exist in about three years when the vessels now under construction will be completed. In order to make plain the need for officers, the subject must be approached in a logical manner, and to do this we must consider the needs of each ship constructed and under construction.

"Taking then the sum of the needs of the individual ships, we reach the needs of the service, considering incidentally the need for a reserve, and other reasons which will prevent the total number of officers on the list from actually serving on board ship in time of war. To this end the following is submitted:

Line officers required to man a battle ship.

- 1 commanding officer.
- 1 executive officer.
- 1 chief engineer.
- 1 navigating officer.
- 6 turret officers.
- 2 secondary battery officers.
- 3 powder division officers.
- 2 assistants to chief engineer.

17 in all.

"In order to make plain that the above table is the lowest possible estimate of officers actually needed on board battle ships, there is furnished the following table showing the number of officers actually placed on board ships of similar displacement by foreign powers:

Nation and ship.	Number of line officers.	Remarks.
England, Barfleur.....	33	Includes midshipmen.
France, Bouvet.....	26	Do.
Germany, Kaiser Friedrich III	20	In addition to this there are a number of midshipmen not given here.

"It will be seen at a glance in comparing the above table with the first table that the Bureau's estimate, which includes cadets, is at least 30 per cent smaller than actual conditions now existing in other navies.

"In preparing the following tables the Bureau has estimated for the smaller vessels by assigning to them complements of officers such as are actually carried by vessels now in service and of equal displacement. Without going into details it will be readily seen that the Bureau's estimates in these cases are also a minimum. The following tables show the number of officers which would be required on July 1, 1904, to man the ships of the Navy then actually completed, Table A showing the officers needed for vessels which have been commissioned, but which are now out of commission for repairs or in reserve; Table B showing the officers needed for vessels now under construction, but which will be completed by July 1, 1904:

A.

Vessels.	Officers.	Vessels.	Officers.
Texas.....	15	Boston.....	10
Columbia.....	14	Puritan.....	8
Minneapolis.....	14	Miantonomoh.....	8
Baltimore.....	12	Terror.....	8
San Francisco.....	12	Katahdin.....	6
Newark.....	12	Mohican.....	6
Olympia.....	12	10 torpedo boats.....	20
Cincinnati.....	10		
Raleigh.....	10		215
Detroit.....	10	25 per cent reserve.....	53
Montgomery.....	10		
Marblehead.....	10	Total.....	263
Bennington.....	10		

B.

Vessels.	Officers.	Vessels.	Officers.
Maine.....	17	Chattanooga.....	12
Missouri.....	17	Cleveland.....	12
Georgia.....	17	Galveston.....	12
New Jersey.....	17	Tacoma.....	12
Pennsylvania.....	17	Arkansas.....	7
Virginia.....	17	Nevada.....	7
Rhode Island.....	17	Florida.....	7
Ohio.....	17	Wyoming.....	7
California.....	15	16 torpedo-boat destroyers.....	48
Nebraska.....	15	15 torpedo boats.....	30
West Virginia.....	15	7 submarines.....	7
Maryland.....	15		
Colorado.....	15		447
South Dakota.....	15	25 per cent reserve.....	111
St. Louis.....	12		
Milwaukee.....	12	Total.....	558
Charleston.....	12		
Denver.....	12	Grand total.....	826
Des Moines.....	12		

"Attention is invited to the fact that the above estimates do not include officers to man auxiliary vessels which must be used in time of war, such as scouts, *Yale* and *Harvard* type; colliers, supply vessels, refrigerating ships, repair ships, hospital ships, auxiliary gunboats, the *Gloucester* and *Scorpion*

type, and many other similar important craft. Allowing without any reserve that 200 officers would be necessary to man these auxiliary vessels, the total number of officers necessary in order to send to sea the navy which Congress has ordered constructed will be 826 plus 200, or 1,026."

During the consideration of this subject your committee called upon the Department to furnish a statement of the number and duties of the present officers of the Navy. The following statement was furnished, which shows that there are 1,017 line officers, including the cadets, 993 of whom are eligible for sea duty, 709 of whom are on board vessels at the present time or doing duty upon seas, 272 performing duty on shore, 11 on the sick list, and 1 on the waiting list:

Grade.	Total number in grade.	Number in grade who are eligible for sea duty.	Number performing duty on board vessels or beyond seas.	Number performing duty on shore.	On sick list.	On waiting orders.
<i>Line.</i>						
Admiral.....	1	2	1	1		
Rear-admirals.....	32	22	8	13	1	
Captains.....	75	71	33	37		1
Commanders.....	113	103	49	51	3	
Lieutenant-commanders.....	176	175	114	57	4	
Lieutenants.....	305	302	520	480	2	
Lieutenants(junior grade)	69	69	35	33	1	
Ensigns.....	125	125	125			
Naval cadets.....	124	124	124			
Total.....	1,017	993	709	272	11	1

*In addition to this number, 4 other officers, not eligible for sea duty, are performing duty on shore.

*In addition to this number, 15 other officers, not eligible for sea duty, are performing duty on shore.

*In addition to this number, 1 other officer, not eligible for sea duty, is performing duty on shore.

*In addition to this number, 4 other officers, not eligible for sea duty, are performing duty on shore.

It will be seen from the above that we have comparatively few officers that we could call upon to man the new ships now being constructed and at the same time keep in commission those already built. Your committee saw but one remedy to meet the problem of more officers, and that was to increase the number of cadets at the Naval Academy, and accordingly a provision has been inserted in the bill providing for the appointment of 500 additional cadets, 125 each year during the next four years succeeding the passage of this act. Each Senator, Member, and Delegate of the House of Representatives is to have the appointment of 1 and the President 24. For the first year each Senator makes an appointment, and the President one-fourth of those allotted to him, and a sufficient number by Members and Delegates to bring the total up to 125. During each succeeding year the President appoints one-fourth of the number allotted to him and Members and Delegates enough to bring the total up to 125 for each year. This, it will be seen, is a temporary measure, and is in effect only for four years. After that time it is hoped that the present law, which provides for the appointment of a cadet by each Member and Delegate every four years, will produce a sufficient number of officers to satisfy the demands of our growing Navy.

MORE MEN.

The Chief of the Bureau of Navigation has set forth in a communication to the committee the necessity for the enlistment of more men. He estimates that to provide for the manning of our ships now under construction we will need approximately 14,000 men. Under the appropriation act of last year we provided 5,000 of these, who are now under training, and in this year's bill we have made a further increase of 3,000, which is all that will be necessary at the present time.

MARINE CORPS.

The Marine Corps is the military branch of the naval service. The following table shows the estimates for 1903, the amounts carried by this bill, and the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year:

Marine Corps.

	Estimated, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropriated, 1902.
Pay.....	\$1,707,649.23	\$1,707,649.23	\$1,706,504.23
Provisions.....	396,071.50	396,071.50	371,071.50
Clothing.....	340,000.00	340,000.00	290,199.54
Fuel.....	35,000.00	35,000.00	30,000.00
Military stores.....	40,297.00	40,297.00	46,297.00
Transportation and recruiting.....	100,000.00	100,000.00	70,000.00
Repair of barracks.....	50,000.00	50,500.00	24,000.00
Forage.....	6,000.00	11,000.00	6,000.00
Hire of quarters.....	20,748.00	20,748.00	14,748.00
Contingent.....	91,700.00	91,700.00	61,700.00
Public works.....	206,000.00	145,500.00	178,000.00
Total.....	2,993,465.73	2,938,465.73	2,798,520.27

From the above table it will be seen that there is an increase of \$139,945.46 over that of last year.

There is an increase of \$25,000 under the item of provisions and also approximately \$50,000 under that of clothing and \$30,000 under that of transportation and recruiting, which are regarded necessary by the commandant of the Marine Corps. An increase in the contingent item of \$30,000 is also recommended, but a reduction has been made in the public works of approximately \$33,000.

INCREASE OF THE NAVY.

The provision for the increase of the Navy is the last general heading of the naval appropriation bill, and one which, perhaps, excites the most popular interest, inasmuch as it provides for the further construction of ships already authorized and the naval programme.

The following table shows the estimates for this year, the amount carried by this bill, and the amount appropriated last year:

Increase of the Navy.

	Estimates, 1902.	Carried by bill.	Appropriated, 1901.
Construction and machinery	\$17,308,010	\$13,308,010	\$21,000,000
Armor and armament	6,000,000	9,000,000	4,000,000
Equipment	400,000	400,000	400,000
Equipping navy-yards		175,000	

As will be seen from the above table, there is a reduction of \$4,000,000 from the estimates in the item of construction and machinery for work on new vessels already authorized. The Chief Constructor and the Chief Engineer reported to the committee that owing to the delay in the delivery of material, strikes, and other causes the work on vessels building has not progressed as rapidly as anticipated at the time the estimates were submitted, and accordingly the reduction above mentioned has been made.

The following table shows the ships now in process of construction and the degree of their completion on April 1, 1902:

Vessel.	Speed.	Builders.	Degree of completion Apr. 1.
BATTLE SHIPS.			
No. 10. Maine	18	Cramp & Sons	87
No. 11. Missouri	18	Newport News Co.	60
No. 12. Ohio	18	Union Iron Works	56
No. 13. Virginia	19	Newport News Co.	0
No. 14. Nebraska	19	Moran Brothers Co.	0
No. 15. Georgia	19	Bath Iron Works	8
No. 16. New Jersey	19	Fore River Ship and Engine Co.	7
No. 17. Rhode Island	19	do	7
ARMORED CRUISERS.			
No. 4. Pennsylvania	22	Cramp & Sons	19
No. 5. West Virginia	22	Newport News Co.	13
No. 6. California	22	Union Iron Works	4
No. 7. Colorado	22	Cramp & Sons	22
No. 8. Maryland	22	Newport News Co.	12
No. 9. South Dakota	22	Union Iron Works	4
PROTECTED CRUISERS.			
No. 14. Denver	17	Neafie & Levy	77
No. 15. Des Moines	17	Fore River Ship and Engine Co.	67
No. 16. Chattanooga	17	Lewis Nixon	58
No. 17. Galveston	17	Wm. R. Trigg Co.	56
No. 18. Tacoma	17	Union Iron Works	41
No. 19. Cleveland	17	Bath Iron Works	78
No. 20. St. Louis	22	Neafie & Levy	3
No. 21. Milwaukee	22	Union Iron Works	0
No. 22. Charleston	22	Newport News Co.	2
MONITORS.			
No. 7. Arkansas	12	Newport News Co.	94
No. 8. Nevada	12	Bate Iron Works	93
No. 9. Florida	12	Lewis Nixon	90
No. 10. Wyoming	12	Union Iron Works	81
TORPEDO-BOAT DESTROYERS.			
No. 1. Bainbridge	29	Neafie & Levy	99
No. 2. Barry	29	do	99
No. 3. Chauncey	29	do	99
No. 4. Dale	29	Wm. R. Trigg Co.	98
No. 5. Hopkins	29	Harlan & Hollingsworth ..	84
No. 6. Hull	29	do	82
No. 7. Lawrence	30	Fore River Ship and Engine Co.	99
No. 9. McDonough	30	do	98
No. 10. Paul Jones	30	Union Iron Works	87
No. 11. Perry	29	do	93
No. 12. Preble	29	do	90
No. 13. Stewart	29	Gas Engine and Power Co. ..	66
No. 14. Truxton	30	Maryland Steel Co.	88
No. 15. Whipple	30	do	85
No. 16. Worden	30	do	85
TORPEDO BOATS.			
No. 19. Stringham	30	Harlan & Hollingsworth ..	98
No. 20. Goldsborough	30	Wolff & Zwicker	94
No. 27. Blakely	26	Geo. Lawley & Son	98
No. 28. De Long	26	do	98
No. 29. Nicholson	26	Lewis Nixon	97
No. 30. O'Brien	26	do	98
No. 31. Thornton	26	Wm. R. Trigg Co.	98
No. 34. Tingey	26	Columbian Iron Works ..	74
No. 35. Wilkes	26	Gas Engine and Power Co. ..	96
SUBMARINE TORPEDO BOATS.			
No. 1. Plunger	8	Lewis Nixon	85
No. 3. Adder	8	do	99
No. 4. Grampus	8	Union Iron Works	66
No. 5. Moccasin	8	Lewis Nixon	98
No. 6. Pike	8	Union Iron Works	60
No. 7. Porpoise	8	Lewis Nixon	95
No. 8. Shark	8	do	92

ARMOR AND ARMAMENT.

Your committee recommends under the increase of the Navy an appropriation, as above shown, of \$9,000,000 for armor and armament. The original estimates submitted to the committee called for \$6,000,000 for this object, but an additional estimate was sent in by the Secretary of the Navy, upon recommendation of the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, asking that this appropriation might be increased to \$9,000,000 in view of the fact that the armor makers are furnishing armor much faster than was expected; and in this connection it might be said that an item of \$4,000,000 was inserted in the urgent deficiency bill in order to carry out the terms of the contracts. It might also be of interest to quote from the letter forwarded to the committee from the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance:

"1. The Bureau finds that since the estimates were made the monthly expenditures under this appropriation have increased a great deal and now average about \$800,000 per month, which amounts to over \$9,000,000 per year, and to carry it through the remainder of this fiscal year it has been obliged to ask for an urgent deficiency of \$4,000,000 in addition to the \$4,000,000 appropriated in the last naval bill.

"2. This great increase was not anticipated, nor did the experience of the Bureau lead it to expect such. The increase in expenditures is mainly caused by the unusual rapidity of delivery of armor and of miscellaneous ordnance supplies; by the ship contractors urging the delivery of outfits earlier than anticipated, calling for overtime work at the naval gun factory to meet the demands; by the armor manufacturers delivering armor at a much more rapid rate than was thought would be the case when the contracts therefor were placed, and by the payment of obligations incurred during past years."

It will be recalled that the Secretary of the Navy, under the authority given him by Congress in the naval appropriation act of two years ago, contracted with the armor-plate companies for the manufacture of 37,000 tons of armor for all of the ships authorized by Congress, at the price of \$420 per ton plus the Krupp royalty, not to exceed \$24.32 per ton, and the Harvey royalty, not to exceed \$11.20 per ton, which latter royalty is still a matter of dispute between the Department and the Harvey Company.

NAVAL PROGRAMME.

The naval appropriation act of last year contained the following provision:

"The Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to prepare the plans and specifications of two seagoing battle ships and two armored cruisers, carrying the most suitable armor and armament for vessels of their class, and to submit to Congress a general description of such battle ships and cruisers on the first Monday in December next; and the said Secretary in preparing said plans and description shall review and further consider the questions whether said ships shall be sheathed or unsheathed, what should be the weight and extent of the armor therefor, what should be the form and location of the turrets, whether any changes should be made in the number and kind of guns of the various sizes heretofore constituting the armament of similar ships, what, if any, torpedo tubes should be built into large ships, to what extent electricity should be used for auxiliary purposes, and all other questions which have arisen and are now pending among naval architects and ordnance experts concerning the construction of battle ships and cruisers under modern conditions; and said Secretary shall, to such an extent as he may deem expedient, report to Congress in connection with said description his opinion upon the foregoing questions."

In compliance with the above the Secretary of the Navy transmitted to Congress a report prepared by the Board of Construction, in which report the several matters set forth in the above provision are fully discussed and recommendations made with respect thereto, which recommendations were approved by the Secretary of the Navy.

The committee recommend that for the purpose of further increasing the naval establishment of the United States the President is hereby authorized to have constructed two first-class battle ships carrying the heaviest armor and most powerful ordnance for vessels of their class upon a trial displacement of about 16,000 tons, and to have the highest practicable speed and great radius of action, and to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not exceeding \$4,212,000 each; two first-class armored cruisers of about 14,500 tons trial displacement, carrying the heaviest armor and most powerful armament for vessels of their class, and to have the highest practicable speed and great radius of action, and to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not exceeding \$4,659,000 each; two gunboats of about 1,000 tons trial displacement, to cost, exclusive of armament, not exceeding \$382,000 each.

In view of the fact that there is some public sentiment favorable to building ships in our Government navy-yards, it has been deemed advisable by the committee to insert a provision in the appropriation bill of this year leaving it in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy to build any or all ships in Government yards, but making it mandatory on him to construct at least one battle ship or one armored cruiser in such navy-yard as he may designate, as an experiment; and it is further provided that he shall keep an accurate account of all expenditures for labor and material in the inspection and construction of such ship and report to Congress at each session, and upon the completion of said ship he shall make a detailed report, showing the relative cost of one built by the Government and one by contract.

It is believed by your committee that nothing short of an experiment of this kind will settle the question that has vexed many minds, and at the same time will show whether private contractors have been reasonable in their bids, and furthermore be a basis for future guidance in the continued construction of our Navy. An appropriation of \$175,000 is recommended for each yard in which a ship is built.

The following table shows the approximate cost of a battle ship, an armored cruiser, and a gunboat:

Type.	Displacement.	Cost exclusive of armor and armament.	Armor.	Armament.	Total cost.
	Tons.				
Battle ship	16,000	\$4,211,920	\$1,800,000	\$1,520,857	\$7,532,777
Armored cruiser	14,500	4,659,250	1,175,000	880,069	6,714,319
Gunboat	1,000	381,840	Nothing.	123,908	510,748

The complete cost of 2 first-class battle ships, 2 first-class armored cruisers, and 2 gunboats, with total tonnage of 63,000 tons, recommended in this bill, will be approximately \$29,500,000. These battle ships and cruisers will be larger than any heretofore authorized by Congress, and the plans recommended by the board of construction have already excited the favorable comment of the naval authorities abroad. The committee is of the opinion that in recommending the above naval programme it is making a substantial and healthy increase of our Navy, and one which will meet everywhere with popular favor.

PREVIOUS NAVAL PROGRAMMES.

It might be of interest in this connection to give a statement of the ships authorized each year by Congress since the commencement of the new Navy.

TABLE I.—Ships authorized each year by Congress to be built for the United States Navy since the commencement of the "new navy."

[Does not include ships of a status other than that of "authorized to be built."]

Date of authorization and class.	Tonnage.	Name.	Number in each class.	Total number for year.	Total tonnage for year.		
Mar. 3, 1883.							
Protected cruisers	5,000	Chicago	3	4	12,486		
	3,000	Boston					
	3,000	Atlanta					
Dispatch vessel	1,486	Dolphin	1				
1884 (none).							
Mar. 3, 1885.							
Protected cruisers	4,098	Newark	2	4	10,430		
	3,730	Charleston					
Gunboats	1,710	Yorktown	2				
	892	Petrel					
Aug. 3, 1886.							
Monitors	6,060	Puritan	4	9	36,474		
	3,990	Monadnock					
	3,990	Amphitrite					
	3,990	Terror					
Second-class battle ships.	6,682	Maine	2				
	6,315	Texas					
Protected cruiser	4,413	Baltimore	1				
Dynamite gunboat	929	Vesuvius	1				
Torpedo boat	105	Cushing	1				
Mar. 3, 1887.							
Monitors	3,990	Miantonomoh	2	6	19,916		
	4,084	Monterey					
Protected cruisers	4,324	Philadelphia	2				
	4,088	San Francisco					
Gunboats	1,710	Concord	2				
	1,710	Bennington					
Sept. 7, 1888.							
Armored cruiser	8,200	New York	1	8	27,602		
Protected cruisers	5,870	Olympia					
	3,213	Cincinnati	6				
	3,213	Raleigh					
	2,089	Montgomery	1				
	2,089	Detroit					
	2,089	Marblehead					
Gunboat	839	Bancroft	1				
Mar. 2, 1889.							
Gunboats	1,177	Machias	2	3	4,509		
	1,177	Castine					
Ram	2,155	Katahdin	1				
June 30, 1890.							
Battle ships	10,288	Indiana	3	5	38,359		
	10,288	Massachusetts					
Protected cruisers	10,288	Oregon	1				
	7,375	Columbia					
Torpedo boat	120	Ericsson	1				
Mar. 2, 1891.							
Protected cruiser	7,375	Minneapolis	1	1	7,335		
July 19, 1892.							
Battle ship	11,340	Iowa	1	2	20,555		
Armored cruiser	9,215	Brooklyn					
Mar. 3, 1893.							
Gunboats	1,371	Nashville	3	4	4,270		
	1,362	Wilmington					
	1,362	Helena					
Submarine	120	Plunger	1				
July 26, 1894.							
Torpedo boats	142	Foote	3	3	426		
	142	Rodgers					
	142	Winslow					
Mar. 2, 1895.							
Battle ships	11,525	Kearsarge	2	11	29,562		
	11,525	Kentucky					
Gunboats	1,000	Annapolis	6				
	1,000	Vicksburg					
	1,000	Newport					
	1,000	Princeton	1				
	1,000	Wheeling					
	1,000	Marietta					
Torpedo boats	165	Porter	3				
	165	Du Pont					
	182	Rowan					
June 10, 1896.							
Battle ships	11,525	Illinois	3	13	35,919		
	11,525	Alabama					
	11,525	Wisconsin					
Torpedo boats	146	Dahlgren	10				
	146	Craven					
	273	Farragut					
	65	Mackenzie					
	132	Fox					
	105	Morris					
	46	Talbot					
	46	Gwin					
	132	Davis					
	65	McKee					

TABLE I.—Ships authorized each year by Congress, etc.—Continued.

Date of authorization and class.	Tonnage.	Name.	Number in each class.	Total number for year.	Total tonnage for year.
Mar. 3, 1897.					
Torpedo boats	340	Stringham	3	4	1,724
	247	Goldsbrough			
Practice vessel (sailing) ..	235	Bailey			
	902	Chesapeake	1		
May 4, 1898.					
Battle ships	12,500	Maine	3		
	12,500	Missouri			
	12,500	Ohio			
Destroyers	420	Bainbridge	16		
	420	Barry			
	420	Chauncey			
	420	Dale			
	420	Decatur			
	408	Hopkins			
	408	Hull			
	400	Lawrence			
	400	McDonough			
	420	Paul Jones			
	420	Perry			
	420	Preble			
	420	Stewart			
	433	Truxton			
	433	Whipple			
	433	Worden			
Torpedo boats	167	Bagley	12	36	59,057
	167	Barney			
	167	Biddle			
	165	Blakely			
	165	De Long			
	174	Nicholson			
	174	O'Brien			
	166	Shubrick			
	166	Stockton			
	165	Thornton			
	165	Tingey			
	165	Wilkes			
Gunboat (not yet built) ..	(?)	To replace Michigan	1		
Monitors	3,214	Arkansas	4		
	3,214	Florida			
	3,214	Nevada			
	3,214	Wyoming			
Mar. 3, 1899.					
Battle ships	14,600	Virginia	3		
	15,000	Nebraska			
	15,000	Georgia			
Armored cruisers	14,000	Pennsylvania	3	12	104,600
	14,000	West Virginia			
	14,000	California			
Protected cruisers	3,100	Denver	6		
	3,100	Des Moines			
	3,100	Chattanooga			
	3,100	Galveston			
	3,100	Tacoma			
	3,100	Cleveland			
June 7, 1900.					
Battle ships	15,000	New Jersey	2		
	14,600	Rhode Island			
	13,600	Colorado			
Armored cruisers	13,600	Maryland	3		
	13,600	South Dakota			
	13,600	St. Louis			
Protected cruisers	9,600	Milwaukee	3	14	99,920
	9,600	Charleston			
	9,600	Adder			
Submarine*	120	Grampus	6		
	120	Moccasin			
	120	Pike			
	120	Porpoise			
	120	Shark			
	120				
1901 (none).					

*The *Holland* (74 tons) was not authorized to be built, but was purchased April 11, 1900.

TABLE II.—Ships authorized each year by Congress to be built for the United States Navy since the commencement of the "new navy."

[Does not include ships of a status other than that of "authorized to be built."]

Class or type of ship.	1883.		1884.	1885.		1886.	
	Number.	Total tonnage.		Number.	Total tonnage.	Number.	Total tonnage.
Battle ships, first or second class ..						2	12,997
Monitors						4	18,030
Cruisers, from 3,000 to 6,000 tons, second class ..	3	11,000		2	7,828	1	4,413
Unprotected cruisers, over 1,000 tons ..	1	1,486					
Gunboats				2	2,602	1	929
Torpedo boats						1	105
Total	4	12,486		4	10,430	9	36,474

TABLE II.—Ships authorized each year by Congress, etc.—Continued.

Class or type of ship.	1887.		1888.		1889.		1890.	
	Number.	Total tonnage.	Number.	Total tonnage.	Number.	Total tonnage.	Number.	Total tonnage.
Battle ships, first or second class.							3	30,864
Monitors.	2	8,074						
Armored cruisers.			1	8,200				
Cruisers, over 6,000 tons, first class.							1	7,375
Cruisers, from 3,000 to 6,000 tons, second class.	2	8,422	3	12,296				
Cruisers, under 3,000 tons, third class.			3	6,267				
Unprotected cruisers, over 1,000 tons.	1	1,486						
Gunboats.			1	839	2	2,854		
Torpedo boats.							1	120
Training vessels and ram.					*1	2,155		
Total.	6	19,916	8	27,602	3	4,509	5	38,359

Class or type of ship.	1891.		1892.		1893.		1894.	
	Number.	Total tonnage.	Number.	Total tonnage.	Number.	Total tonnage.	Number.	Total tonnage.
Battle ships, first or second class.			1	11,340				
Armored cruisers.			1	9,215				
Cruisers, over 6,000 tons, first class.	1	7,375						
Gunboats.					3	4,155		
Torpedo boats.							3	423
Submarine.					1	120		
Total.	1	7,375	2	20,555	4	4,270	3	423

Class or type of ship.	1895.		1896.		1897.		1898.	
	Number.	Total tonnage.	Number.	Total tonnage.	Number.	Total tonnage.	Number.	Total tonnage.
Battle ships, first or second class.	2	23,050	3	34,575			3	37,500
Monitors.							4	12,856
Gunboats.	6	6,000						
Destroyers.	3	512	10	1,344	3	822	16	6,695
Torpedo boats.							12	2,006
Training vessels and ram.					1	902		
Total.	11	29,562	13	35,919	4	1,724	36	59,057

Class or type of ship.	1899.		1900.		1901.	1902.	Total in class.
	Number.	Total tonnage.	Number.	Total tonnage.			
Battle ships, first or second class.	3	44,600	2	29,600			*19
Armored cruisers.	3	42,000	3	40,800			8
Monitors.							10
Cruisers over 6,000 tons, first class.			3	28,800			5
Cruisers from 3,000 to 6,000 tons, second class.	6	18,000					17
Cruisers under 3,000 tons, third class.							3
Unprotected cruisers over 1,000 tons.							1
Gunboats.							*18
Destroyers.							16
Torpedo boats.							34
Submarine.			6	720			*7
Training vessels and ram.							*2
Total.	12	104,600	14	99,920			

* Ram. * Two of these battle ships were second class, *Maine* and *Texas*.

* One gunboat to replace *Michigan*, never built.

* An eighth submarine, the *Holland*, was authorized to be purchased. Date of purchase, April 11, 1900.

* The ram was the *Katahdin*.

COST OF SHIPS OF NEW NAVY.

Vessels of the new Navy, built since 1882 and completed to December 31, 1901, number 73, and have cost \$124,899,091.89. Of these, 24 are torpedo boats and 55 are vessels of other classes, as shown in the table below.

The vessels building number 59, and of these 32 are torpedo boats and destroyers, leaving 27 vessels of other classes. The estimated cost of completing these vessels is (June 30, 1900) \$110,183,118. Deducting the appropriations for these vessels—

Fiscal year 1901	\$17,140,699
Fiscal year 1902	29,400,000
Balance on hand in Treasury June 30, 1900	9,562,406
Balance to credit of appropriation for submarine torpedo boat	105,635
Amounts since deposited or allowed on submarine torpedo boat	94,365
Total	56,303,105

shows a balance of \$53,880,013 required to be appropriated to complete the said vessels, outside of any appropriation that may be made or vessels authorized by the present naval bill. Therefore the total number of vessels of the Navy, built and building, is 138, of which 56 are torpedo boats and destroyers, and the total cost will be \$235,082,209.89.

Type.	Built.	Building.	Total.
Battle ships	10	8	18
Armored cruisers	2	6	8
Protected cruisers	12	9	21
Unprotected cruisers	3		3
Armored ram	1		1
Monitors	6	4	10
Gunboats	16		16
Training ship	1		1
Special class	2		2
Torpedo-boat destroyers		16	16
Torpedo boats	24	9	33
Submarine torpedo boats		7	7
Total	77	59	136
Vessels lost (<i>Maine</i> and <i>Charleston</i>)	2		2
	79		138

The above table does not include the protected cruisers *Albatross* and *New Orleans*, the gunboat *Topeka*, nor the torpedo boats *Manley* and *Somers*, vessels purchased during the Spanish war; neither does it include the submarine torpedo boat *Holland*, nor captured vessels.

It will be seen from the above table that while we have built and are building, all told, 138 ships, yet comparatively few of them have any real fighting value. Our naval prowess lies almost entirely in our 18 battle ships, 8 armored cruisers, and 21 protected cruisers. The rest of our ships would cut but little figure in actual war. Ships of the battle line practically alone determine the naval strength of a nation.

NAVAL PROGRAMMES OF OTHER COUNTRIES.

Below is a table showing the building programmes for 1901-2, and for 1902-3, of the principal naval powers of the world:

Building programmes for 1901-2, and for 1902-3.

	England.	France.	Germany.	United States.*	Russia.	Japan. ^b	Austria.	Italy.
1901-2.								
Battle ships	3	2	2				3	2
Armored cruisers	6	1	1				1	
Other cruisers	2		3		3			
Gunboats	2							
Destroyers	10	10	6		6			
Torpedo boats	5	11						
Submarines	5	8						
1902-3.								
Battle ships	2	4	2		5		1	3
Armored cruisers	2	2	1					
Other cruisers	2		3					
Gunboats		2	1					
Destroyers	13	2						
Torpedo boats	4	16						
Submarines	4							
Ships built and building.								
Battle ships	55	24	29	17	19	6	15	9
Armored cruisers	26	24	11	9	12	5	3	10
Coast defense and monitors	29	14	(^c)	10	24	7	4	7
Cruisers	117	55	30	27	32	27	13	26
Gunboats	68	22	17	18	11	13	14	14
Destroyers	120	43	(^c)	16	51	11		13
Torpedo boats	171	253	(^c)	35	197	103	63	142
Submarines	5			8				1

* No ships authorized in 1901-2, 1902-3.

^b 1902-3, completing programme of 1900. A complete programme is to be considered; no information available, 1902-3.

^c Included in battle ships, as in German budget.

Of all the countries, Germany has been building during the last few years faster than any of the others. Her shipbuilding programme started in 1898 and will be completed in 1908, possibly in 1907, instead of 1916, as first planned. Her programme contemplates the following new vessels: Four squadrons each of 8 battle ships, 2 battle ships for flagships, 4 battle ships in reserve. Besides these there are to be 14 large cruisers, 38 smaller cruisers, and 16 divisions of torpedo boats of 6 each. This programme will give her in all 38 battle ships, 14 large cruisers, 38 smaller cruisers, and 96 torpedo boats. After the completion of this programme the plan contemplates new constructions to replace ships which, though still serviceable, may have reached the prescribed age limit.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NEW NAVY.

In 1883 we began the construction of our present Navy, and down to 1901, inclusive, \$555,664,000 was appropriated. Of this sum \$590,393,000 has been expended, leaving an unexpended balance of \$85,271,000. The following communication from the Secretary of the Navy, with the accompanying statement, shows the amount of appropriations made each year since the beginning of the construction of the new Navy, and the disposition of the same:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, April 2, 1902.

SIR: Replying to your letter of the 17th ultimo, requesting to be furnished with a statement showing the amount of the appropriations made each year since the beginning of the construction of the new Navy; how much of these

appropriations has been used each year, and how much has been covered back into the Treasury; how much of that expended has been used under the different bureaus; how much for the maintenance of the personnel of the Navy, and how much has gone into the public works at navy-yards and naval stations. I have the honor to inclose herewith tabular statements, prepared by the Paymaster-General of the Navy, showing the appropriations, expenditures, and balances pertaining to the naval establishment, by fiscal years from 1883 to 1901, inclusive, as follows:

Statement No. 1. Maintenance of personnel.

Nos. 1 A and 1 B. Pay and subsistence, respectively, as combined in statement No. 1.

No. 2. Appropriations and expenditures under all annual appropriations, by bureaus, for each year separately.

Nos. 2 A and 2 B. Summaries of statement No. 2, by years and bureaus, respectively.

No. 3. Appropriations and expenditures for public works.

No. 4. Increase of the Navy.

No. 5. Special appropriation for specific objects.

Nos. 6, 6 A, and 6 B. War appropriations and expenditures for Marine Corps and miscellaneous appropriations.

No. 7. Summary of appropriations, expenditures, and balances shown in detail by statements from No. 1 to 6 B, inclusive.

The Paymaster-General, in forwarding the above statements, reports as follows:

"In preparing these statements odd dollars and cents have been discarded, but the aggregates are approximately correct. It will be noted from the summary statement, No. 7, that the total of the appropriations for the entire period of nineteen years is \$965,684,000; expenditures, \$590,393,000; balances, \$365,271,000, of which the sum of \$25,895,000 for increase of the Navy and public works remained available for future expenditures on account of these objects, the balance of about \$40,000,000 having been or will be carried to the surplus fund of the Treasury. Adding to the above the total appropriations of about \$32,000,000 for the current fiscal year makes the grand total of appropriations for the twenty years since the beginning of the new Navy approximately \$738,000,000."

Very respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG, *Secretary,*

Hon. GEO. EDMUND FOSS,

Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives.

STATEMENT No. 1.

MAINTENANCE OF PERSONNEL.

[This covers pay and subsistence only, the cost of each being shown in Statements Nos. 1 A and 1 B annexed.]

Year.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
1883	\$8,145,000	\$8,145,000	
1884	8,145,000	8,145,000	
1885	7,915,000	7,915,000	
1886	7,930,000	7,930,000	
1887	7,980,000	7,900,000	\$80,000
1888	8,245,000	8,140,000	105,000
1889	8,340,000	8,330,000	10,000
1890	8,275,000	8,130,000	145,000
1891	8,225,000	8,065,000	160,000
1892	8,310,000	8,100,000	210,000
1893	8,300,000	8,140,000	160,000
1894	8,480,000	8,430,000	50,000
1895	8,630,000	8,610,000	20,000
1896	8,960,000	8,955,000	5,000
1897	9,020,000	9,485,000	125,000
1898	9,485,000	9,400,000	85,000
1899	10,460,000	10,575,000	375,000
1900	16,185,000	12,730,000	3,435,000
1901	14,960,000	14,960,000	
Total	177,010,000	172,145,000	4,865,000

Total cost: "Maintenance of personnel" entire period, approximately \$172,145,000.

NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1902.

STATEMENT No. 1 A.

PAY OF THE NAVY.

Appropriations and expenditures.

Year.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
1883	\$7,235,000	\$7,235,000	
1884	7,135,000	7,135,000	
1885	6,910,000	6,910,000	
1886	6,940,000	6,940,000	
1887	7,000,000	7,000,000	
1888	7,215,000	7,210,000	\$5,000
1889	7,350,000	7,340,000	10,000
1890	7,285,000	7,140,000	145,000
1891	7,250,000	7,125,000	125,000
1892	7,370,000	7,095,000	205,000
1893	7,300,000	7,155,000	145,000
1894	7,380,000	7,380,000	
1895	7,555,000	7,555,000	
1896	7,885,000	7,885,000	
1897	8,345,000	8,310,000	35,000
1898	8,240,000	8,160,000	80,000
1899	9,125,000	9,125,000	
1900	13,500,000	11,300,000	2,200,000
1901	12,810,000	12,810,000	
Total	153,790,000	150,810,000	2,980,000

* Figures for 1890 given on basis of authorized peace quota.

Total pay entire period, \$150,810,000.

NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1902.

STATEMENT No. 1-B.

SUBSISTENCE.

Appropriations and expenditures under "Provisions, Navy," less amounts expended under this appropriation for labor, included in statement No. 2 ("Supplies and Accounts").

Year.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
1883	\$810,000	\$810,000	
1884	1,010,000	1,010,000	
1885	1,005,000	1,005,000	
1886	980,000	980,000	
1887	960,000	960,000	\$80,000
1888	1,020,000	990,000	100,000
1889	990,000	990,000	
1890	990,000	990,000	
1891	975,000	970,000	5,000
1892	1,010,000	1,005,000	5,000
1893	1,000,000	985,000	15,000
1894	1,050,000	1,050,000	
1895	1,075,000	1,055,000	20,000
1896	1,075,000	1,070,000	5,000
1897	1,275,000	1,185,000	90,000
1898	1,245,000	1,240,000	5,000
1899	1,825,000	1,450,000	375,000
1900	2,685,000	1,450,000	1,235,000
1901	2,150,000	2,150,000	
Total	23,250,000	21,335,000	1,915,000

Total cost of subsistence entire period, \$21,335,000.

NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1902.

STATEMENT No. 2.

Appropriations and expenditures under all annual appropriations (except for "Maintenance of personnel," shown in statement No. 1) for each year and each bureau.

Bureau.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
1883.			
Secretary's office	\$450,000	\$450,000	
Yards and Docks	520,000	514,000	\$12,000
Equipment	819,000	806,000	13,000
Navigation	329,000	329,000	
Ordnance	338,000	252,000	86,000
Construction and Repair	1,772,000	1,730,000	42,000
Steam Engineering	1,218,000	1,216,000	2,000
Supplies and Accounts	157,000	124,000	33,000
Medicine and Surgery	132,000	127,000	5,000
Total	5,747,000	5,554,000	193,000
1884.			
Secretary's office	402,000	402,000	
Yards and Docks	568,000	512,000	56,000
Equipment	868,000	863,000	5,000
Navigation	301,000	287,000	14,000
Ordnance	409,000	305,000	104,000
Construction and Repair	1,354,000	1,347,000	7,000
Steam Engineering	1,011,000	1,007,000	4,000
Supplies and Accounts	136,000	134,000	2,000
Medicine and Surgery	130,000	123,000	7,000
Total	5,179,000	4,980,000	199,000
1885.			
Secretary's office	398,000	398,000	
Yards and Docks	424,000	416,000	8,000
Equipment	824,000	823,000	1,000
Navigation	265,000	260,000	5,000
Ordnance	242,000	229,000	20,000
Construction and Repair	1,023,000	1,021,000	2,000
Steam Engineering	931,000	923,000	8,000
Supplies and Accounts	131,000	129,000	2,000
Medicine and Surgery	125,000	116,000	9,000
Total	4,263,000	4,308,000	55,000
1886.			
Secretary's office	396,000	381,000	15,000
Yards and Docks	429,000	418,000	11,000
Equipment	888,000	789,000	99,000
Navigation	322,000	315,000	7,000
Ordnance	231,000	227,000	4,000
Construction and Repair	1,020,000	1,019,000	1,000
Steam Engineering	961,000	816,000	145,000
Supplies and Accounts	146,000	140,000	6,000
Medicine and Surgery	125,000	106,000	19,000
Total	4,518,000	4,211,000	307,000
1887.			
Secretary's office	254,000	247,000	7,000
Yards and Docks	440,000	430,000	10,000
Equipment	854,000	779,000	75,000
Navigation	302,000	296,000	6,000
Ordnance	211,000	206,000	5,000
Construction and Repair	943,000	940,000	3,000
Steam Engineering	791,000	772,000	19,000
Supplies and Account	175,000	153,000	22,000
Medicine and Surgery	120,000	107,000	13,000
Total	4,090,000	3,990,000	100,000

Appropriations and expenditures under all annual appropriations, etc.—Cont'd

Bureau.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
1888.			
Secretary's office	\$228,000	\$222,000	\$4,000
Yards and Docks	749,000	724,000	25,000
Equipment	604,000	640,000	54,000
Navigation	301,000	287,000	14,000
Ordnance	233,000	207,000	26,000
Construction and Repair	965,000	953,000	32,000
Steam Engineering	603,000	657,000	36,000
Supplies and Accounts	232,000	228,000	4,000
Medicine and Surgery	133,000	128,000	5,000
Total	4,226,000	4,028,000	200,000
1889.			
Secretary's office	323,000	322,000	1,000
Yards and Docks	614,000	600,000	14,000
Equipment	808,000	800,000	8,000
Navigation	314,000	307,000	7,000
Ordnance	365,000	237,000	128,000
Construction and Repair	845,000	838,000	7,000
Steam Engineering	632,000	630,000	2,000
Supplies and Accounts	188,000	185,000	3,000
Medicine and Surgery	129,000	128,000	1,000
Total	4,218,000	4,047,000	171,000
1890.			
Secretary's office	259,000	258,000	1,000
Yards and Docks	525,000	508,000	22,000
Equipment	853,000	776,000	77,000
Navigation	312,000	310,000	2,000
Ordnance	264,000	245,000	19,000
Construction and Repair	1,070,000	1,051,000	19,000
Steam Engineering	623,000	620,000	3,000
Supplies and Accounts	214,000	207,000	7,000
Medicine and Surgery	123,000	120,000	3,000
Total	4,243,000	4,090,000	153,000
1891.			
Secretary's office	266,000	266,000	
Yards and Docks	628,000	612,000	16,000
Equipment	943,000	931,000	12,000
Navigation	271,000	255,000	16,000
Ordnance	254,000	248,000	6,000
Construction and Repair	1,020,000	1,001,000	19,000
Steam Engineering	663,000	642,000	21,000
Supplies and Accounts	203,000	201,000	2,000
Medicine and Surgery	126,000	120,000	6,000
Total	4,374,000	4,274,000	100,000
1892.			
Secretary's office	277,000	277,000	
Yards and Docks	680,000	669,000	11,000
Equipment	964,000	953,000	11,000
Navigation	273,000	267,000	6,000
Ordnance	280,000	273,000	7,000
Construction and Repair	1,020,000	1,012,000	8,000
Steam Engineering	713,000	639,000	14,000
Supplies and Accounts	202,000	201,000	1,000
Medicine and Surgery	125,000	125,000	
Total	4,564,000	4,476,000	88,000
1893.			
Secretary's office	281,000	276,000	5,000
Yards and Docks	652,000	643,000	9,000
Equipment	956,000	943,000	13,000
Navigation	263,000	252,000	11,000
Ordnance	280,000	275,000	5,000
Construction and Repair	970,000	956,000	14,000
Steam Engineering	663,000	652,000	11,000
Supplies and Accounts	200,000	198,000	2,000
Medicine and Surgery	122,000	122,000	
Total	4,337,000	4,317,000	20,000
1894.			
Secretary's office	287,000	284,000	3,000
Yards and Docks	651,000	641,000	10,000
Equipment	979,000	978,000	1,000
Navigation	291,000	282,000	9,000
Ordnance	326,000	320,000	6,000
Construction and Repair	970,000	965,000	5,000
Steam Engineering	782,000	772,000	10,000
Supplies and Accounts	211,000	209,000	2,000
Medicine and Surgery	126,000	126,000	
Total	4,623,000	4,577,000	46,000
1895.			
Secretary's office	339,000	338,000	1,000
Yards and Docks	707,000	689,000	18,000
Equipment	1,147,000	1,111,000	36,000
Navigation	344,000	326,000	18,000
Ordnance	325,000	323,000	2,000
Construction and Repair	1,078,000	1,071,000	7,000
Steam Engineering	690,000	689,000	1,000
Supplies and Accounts	215,000	210,000	5,000
Medicine and Surgery	126,000	126,000	
Total	4,971,000	4,883,000	88,000
1896.			
Secretary's office	368,000	363,000	5,000
Yards and Docks	806,000	796,000	10,000
Equipment	1,327,000	1,317,000	10,000

Appropriations and expenditures under all annual appropriations, etc.—Cont'd.

Bureau.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
1896.			
Navigation	\$339,000	\$334,000	\$5,000
Ordnance	450,000	444,000	6,000
Construction and Repair	620,000	619,000	1,000
Steam Engineering	696,000	694,000	2,000
Supplies and Accounts	213,000	208,000	5,000
Medicine and Surgery	130,000	130,000	
Total	5,249,000	5,205,000	44,000
1897.			
Secretary's office	341,000	340,000	1,000
Yards and Docks	821,000	809,000	12,000
Equipment	1,369,000	1,366,000	3,000
Navigation	377,000	364,000	13,000
Ordnance	538,000	533,000	5,000
Construction and Repair	2,120,000	2,118,000	2,000
Steam Engineering	350,000	349,000	1,000
Supplies and Accounts	253,000	248,000	5,000
Medicine and Surgery	143,000	143,000	
Total	6,977,000	6,935,000	42,000
1898.			
Secretary's office	359,000	350,000	9,000
Yards and Docks	835,000	790,000	45,000
Equipment	1,609,000	1,606,000	4,000
Navigation	351,000	344,000	7,000
Ordnance	546,000	533,000	13,000
Construction and Repair	2,120,000	2,117,000	3,000
Steam Engineering	398,000	393,000	5,000
Supplies and Accounts	281,000	276,000	5,000
Medicine and Surgery	149,000	149,000	
Total	7,548,000	7,457,000	91,000
1899.			
Secretary's office	466,000	461,000	5,000
Yards and Docks	1,123,000	1,102,000	21,000
Equipment	1,954,000	1,947,000	7,000
Navigation	574,000	543,000	31,000
Ordnance	1,585,000	1,566,000	19,000
Construction and Repair	4,023,000	3,973,000	50,000
Steam Engineering	1,353,000	1,351,000	2,000
Supplies and Accounts	272,000	268,000	4,000
Medicine and Surgery	157,000	155,000	2,000
Total	11,507,000	11,366,000	141,000
1900.			
Secretary's office	700,000	675,000	25,000
Yards and Docks	1,013,000	993,000	20,000
Equipment	2,537,000	2,522,000	15,000
Navigation	699,000	634,000	65,000
Ordnance	2,245,000	2,223,000	22,000
Construction and Repair	5,703,000	5,703,000	
Steam Engineering	2,684,000	2,684,000	
Supplies and Accounts	555,000	500,000	55,000
Medicine and Surgery	196,000	196,000	
Total	16,585,000	16,430,000	155,000
1901.			
Secretary's office	749,000	749,000	
Yards and Docks	1,110,000	1,110,000	
Equipment	4,109,000	4,079,000	30,000
Navigation	745,000	745,000	
Ordnance	1,723,000	1,693,000	30,000
Construction and Repair	7,526,000	7,526,000	
Steam Engineering	3,174,000	3,099,000	75,000
Supplies and Accounts	581,000	571,000	10,000
Medicine and Surgery	205,000	205,000	
Total	19,022,000	19,777,000	145,000

STATEMENT NO. 2 A.

Summary of statement 2, by years, all bureaus.

Year.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
1888	\$5,747,000	\$5,554,000	\$193,000
1889	5,179,000	4,980,000	199,000
1890	4,363,000	4,308,000	55,000
1891	4,518,000	4,211,000	307,000
1892	4,090,000	3,930,000	160,000
1893	4,226,000	4,028,000	200,000
1894	4,218,000	4,047,000	171,000
1895	4,243,000	4,090,000	153,000
1896	4,374,000	4,274,000	100,000
1897	4,564,000	4,476,000	88,000
1898	4,337,000	4,317,000	20,000
1899	4,623,000	4,577,000	46,000
1900	4,971,000	4,883,000	88,000
1901	5,249,000	5,205,000	44,000
1902	6,977,000	6,935,000	42,000
1903	7,548,000	7,457,000	91,000
1904	11,507,000	11,366,000	141,000
1905	16,585,000	16,430,000	155,000
1906	19,022,000	19,777,000	145,000
Total	127,291,000	124,843,000	2,448,000

Total expenditures under all annual appropriations, entire period (excepting for "Maintenance of personnel," statement No. 1), \$124,843,000.

STATEMENT No. 2 B.

Summary of statement 2, by bureaus, entire period.

Bureau.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
Secretary's office	\$7,147,000	\$7,065,000	\$82,000
Yards and Docks	13,301,000	12,971,000	330,000
Equipment	24,832,000	24,328,000	504,000
Navigation	6,943,000	6,737,000	206,000
Ordnance	11,208,000	10,690,000	518,000
Construction and Repair	36,462,000	36,240,000	222,000
Steam Engineering	20,226,000	19,865,000	361,000
Supplies and Accounts	4,545,000	4,390,000	155,000
Medicine and Surgery	2,627,000	2,557,000	70,000
Total	127,291,000	124,843,000	2,448,000

Total expenditures under all annual appropriations, entire period (excepting for "Maintenance of personnel," statement No. 1), \$124,843,000.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1902.

STATEMENT No. 3.

PUBLIC WORKS.

In addition to items generally classified under the heading of "Public works," this statement includes special appropriations for the purchase of land and improvements of manufacturing plants at navy-yards for entire period 1883 to 1901.

Bureau.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
Yards and Docks	\$28,732,000	\$19,561,000	\$9,171,000
Equipment	1,714,000	643,000	1,071,000
Navigation	2,953,000	2,078,000	875,000
Ordnance	2,716,000	2,376,000	340,000
Construction and Repair	1,905,000	1,067,000	238,000
Steam Engineering	1,465,000	915,000	550,000
Medicine and Surgery	355,000	346,000	9,000
Total	39,240,000	26,986,000	12,254,000

Total expenditures, appropriations for public works, \$26,986,000.
Unexpended balances of appropriations for public works remain available for future expenditures.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1902.

STATEMENT No. 4.

INCREASE OF THE NAVY.

This statement covers all appropriations intended for increasing the Navy directly in the line of construction of new vessels and providing for their armor, armament, and equipment, without regard to the titles assigned by the Treasury Department, for entire period 1883 to 1901.

Object.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
Hull and machinery	\$117,414,000	\$106,194,000	\$11,220,000
Armor and armament	59,435,000	57,801,000	1,634,000
Equipment	2,840,000	2,143,000	697,000
Total	179,689,000	166,138,000	13,551,000

Total expenditures, entire period, for increasing the Navy, \$166,138,000.
Unexpended balances remain available for future expenditures.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1902.

STATEMENT No. 5.

SPECIAL.

Special appropriations (not for any particular year) under the cognizance of the several bureaus, for specific objects, for which the current annual appropriations were not applicable, such as indicated below.

Bureau.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
Equipment	\$237,000	\$53,000	\$184,000
Navigation	265,000	240,000	25,000
Ordnance	545,000	317,000	228,000
Construction and Repair	983,000	980,000	3,000
Steam Engineering	1,113,000	1,013,000	100,000
Supplies and Accounts	41,000	25,000	16,000
Total	3,184,000	2,631,000	553,000

Of the above, the expenditures were chiefly as follows:
Equipment: For coaling barges and water boats.
Navigation: For surveys and outfits for apprentices.
Ordnance: For modern batteries for the *Hartford* and *Chicago*, and for arming and equipping Naval Militia.
Construction and Repair: For repairs to the *Hartford* and *Chicago*.
Steam Engineering: For new machinery for the *Chicago* and *Hartford* and new boilers for the *Atlanta* and *Dolphin*.
Supplies and Accounts: For consolidating and transportation of naval supplies.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1902.

STATEMENT No. 6.

War appropriations and expenditures, 1898-99.

Appropriated	\$100,000,000
Expended	70,000,000
Balances	30,000,000

NOTE.—War appropriations are omitted from preceding statements for the reason that to include them would lessen the usefulness of the tables for purposes of comparison.

No. 6 A.

Marine Corps appropriations and expenditures (1883 to 1901, inclusive).

Appropriated	\$21,750,000
Expended	20,650,000
Balances	1,100,000

NOTE.—The above approximate expenditures of the Marine Corps can not be classified by the Bureau in detail, as disbursements for the Marine Corps have not been made through this office during the entire period mentioned.

No. 6 B.

Miscellaneous appropriations.

Appropriated	\$7,500,000
Expended	7,000,000
Balances	500,000

Relief acts, appropriations to cover damages, and for special astronomical observations, expeditions to polar regions, International Naval Review, etc., being directly for naval use, but not assignable to any particular bureau or year.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1902.

STATEMENT No. 7.

SUMMARY.

Appropriations, expenditures, and balances for the entire naval establishment from 1883 to 1901, inclusive.

Objects.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
Increasing the Navy: Statement No. 4.	\$179,689,000	\$166,138,000	\$13,551,000
Public works: Statement No. 3.	39,240,000	26,986,000	12,254,000
Maintenance of personnel: Statement No. 1.	177,010,000	172,145,000	4,865,000
Annual purposes: Statement No. 2.	127,291,000	124,843,000	2,448,000
Special: Statement No. 5.	3,184,000	2,631,000	553,000
War purposes: Statement No. 6.	100,000,000	70,000,000	30,000,000
Marine Corps: Statement No. 6 A.	21,750,000	20,650,000	1,100,000
Miscellaneous: Statement No. 6 B.	7,500,000	7,000,000	500,000
Grand total	655,664,000	590,393,000	65,271,000

Total expenditures all naval appropriations for period mentioned, \$590,393,000.

NOTE.—Practically all of the unexpended balances (\$25,805,000) shown above for "Increasing the Navy" and "Public works" remained available for expenditures after June 30, 1901. The balances under all other headings (about \$40,000,000) have been or will be carried to the surplus fund.

Appropriations (about \$82,000,000) and expenditures for the current year (1902) are not included, as the expenditures are of course incomplete, and can not be even approximated as yet.

Adding the appropriations to the aggregate for previous years will make a grand total, since the beginning of the "New Navy" to date (1883 to 1902) of approximately \$738,000,000.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1902.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HEMENWAY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to resolutions and bills of the following titles:

S. R. 82. Joint resolution providing for the printing annually of franks required for sending out seed;

S. 1295. An act to amend an act authorizing the construction of a railway, street railway, motor, wagon, and pedestrian bridge over the Missouri River near Council Bluffs, Iowa, and Omaha, Nebr., approved February 13, 1891, and amended by an act approved January 28, 1893, and by an act approved April 21, 1898, and to authorize the Omaha Bridge and Terminal Railway Company, successor to the Interstate Bridge and Street Railway Company, to complete, reconstruct, and change a bridge for railway and street railway purposes over the Missouri River near Council Bluffs, Iowa, and Omaha, Nebr.;

S. 2951. An act granting an increase of pension to Maria J. Wilson;

S. C. R. 17. Concurrent resolution to print 10,000 copies of Senate Document No. 84, being a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report of the Secretary of Agriculture in relation to the forests, rivers, and mountains of the Southern Appalachian region, etc.;

S. 5736. An act for the relief of citizens of the French West Indies;

S. 2336. An act granting a pension to Rebecca Coppinger;

S. 1305. An act for the relief of Mrs. Arivella D. Meeker;

S. 4992. An act to provide an American register for the bark *Homeward Bound*; and

S. 4506. An act granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Collier.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the reports of committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of Senate to bills of the following titles:

H. R. 13371. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Palmer; and

H. R. 12054. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Burrill. The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3992) granting an increase of pension to David M. McKnight, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. DEBOE, and Mr. TURNER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

H. R. 12804. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolutions:

House concurrent resolution 50.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed 25,000 copies of so much of the First Assistant Postmaster-General's Report for 1900-1901 as relates to rural free-delivery service, 10,000 copies for the use of the Post-Office Department, 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 copies for the use of the Senate.

House concurrent resolution 49.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed 1,000 copies of the Preliminary Description of the Geological and Water Resources of the Southern Half of the Black Hills and Adjoining Regions in South Dakota and Wyoming, recently prepared by Nelson Horatio Darton, under the direction of the United States Geological Survey, 500 copies for use of the House, 250 copies for use of the Senate, and 250 copies for use of the Secretary of the Interior.

House concurrent resolution 43.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed 3,500 additional copies of the annual report of the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1901, 1,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 500 copies for the use of the Senate, and 2,000 copies for the use of the Department of the Interior.

House concurrent resolution 25.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be published and bound 6,000 copies of the State papers and all correspondence bearing upon the purchase of the Territory of Louisiana by the United States, including the treaty of purchase, 4,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 2,000 for the use of the Senate.

House concurrent resolution 15.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed and bound, by photolithographic process, with an introduction of not to exceed 25 pages, to be prepared by Dr. Cyrus Adler, librarian of the Smithsonian Institution, for the use of Congress, 9,000 copies of Thomas Jefferson's "Morals of Jesus of Nazareth," as the same appears in the National Museum, 3,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 6,000 copies for the use of the House.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 5735. An act to fix the compensation of criers and bailiffs in the United States courts; and

S. R. 98. Joint resolution appropriating the sum of \$500,000, including the \$200,000 already appropriated, for the relief of the French West Indies and St. Vincent.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to my colleague [Mr. RIXEY].

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to make a partisan speech, but to submit a few practical observations upon the bill.

As stated by the chairman of the committee, this bill carries something like \$77,000,000—\$442,000 less than was carried in the bill for 1902; but the chairman might have gone further and stated that it carries \$11,000,000 more than was carried in the bill for 1901, and \$24,000,000 more than was carried in the bill for 1900—an excess over 1900 of nearly as much as the whole naval establishment cost ten years ago. This bill carries less than was estimated for by some \$20,000,000, and the Naval Committee deserves credit for the way in which it has brought down these estimates to the amount carried in the bill, and too much credit can not be given to the patience and untiring and painstaking care which the chairman of the committee has given to this subject.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we can never expect to have a naval bill which will carry less than the present bill. This bill would carry more than the bill for 1902 except for two items. There is a reduction of \$7,000,000, as compared with the bill for 1902, for hulls and machinery. There is also a reduction in the bill for 1903, as compared with the bill for 1902, of \$2,500,000 for the Naval Academy at Annapolis. These two items make \$9,500,000. Taking from that the \$442,000 reduction in this bill, and we

have really an increase for the naval establishment proper of some \$9,000,000.

I take it we may never expect to see the naval bill less than it is as present. This bill carries a provision for 500 new cadets at Annapolis. It carries a provision for 3,000 enlisted men, and it is to be followed by a bill to increase the Medical Corps, the Paymaster's Corps, the pharmacists, and I suppose the Marine Corps. I do not mention these matters in a critical spirit, because I realize that when we build ships we have got to provide the men to man them, and we have got to pay the expenses for that purpose. The time to consider these questions is when we are up against the proposition to build ships.

The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs says that it takes a thousand dollars to keep one of these battle ships in commission one day. I think he has greatly underestimated the amount, for Admiral O'Neil states that for the battle ship *Alabama* the sum of \$70,000 was spent for target practice alone in six months. This is \$449 for every day, Sundays excepted, for target practice, and I take it that the expense for keeping a battle ship in commission can not be less than \$2,000 a day.

I think much of the expense is due to the unfortunate organization of the Navy Department. We have eight separate bureaus in the naval establishment, each bureau presided over by an admiral, each bureau, as I understand it, having jurisdiction over the expenditures for that bureau, and almost every bureau having control of millions of dollars. Some of these bureaus interlap, so that it is impossible to tell where the jurisdiction of one stops and another commences. There are rivalries and contentions, so much so that the Secretary of the Navy has been called upon more than once to settle the jurisdiction of the several bureaus.

The retiring Secretary of the Navy saw the disadvantage of so many bureaus, and time and again he earnestly advocated in his annual reports that at least three of these bureaus should be consolidated. No attention was paid to the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, except that bills were introduced and referred to the Naval Committee, and there they have slept. In the Secretary's last hearing before the Naval Committee, less than thirty days ago, he was asked his opinion as to consolidating some of these bureaus. The Secretary said he was then about to go out of office and that it was not worth while to refer to the matter. I quote his statement:

I have tried every year up to this year, when I have abandoned the attempt simply because I can not carry it through, to consolidate three of our bureaus which I believe could perfectly well be consolidated. I think most of you differ from me in that respect, but it leads to a triple expense. In the yards, where we are either building ships under contract or repairing them at our own yards, the Bureau of Construction and Repair will have an inspector, the Bureau of Steam Engineering will have an inspector, and the Bureau of Equipment will have an inspector. Often in these cases one inspector could superintend all the work. There is a triplication of clerical and other expense which I think might easily be avoided as well as greater efficiency obtained by consolidation.

However, it is not worth while to refer to this matter, because I am overruled by the committee and also resisted by the Bureau officers who do not like to give up their jurisdiction. It is not only the case of the tail wagging the dog, but three tails wagging the dog.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the next matter which I want to call your attention to is on page 38 of the draft of the bill.

Mr. VANDIVER. Before we leave the subject the Secretary has just mentioned, let me ask if the question has been adjudicated as to whether it is possible to consolidate these bureaus. I infer from the statement of the honorable Secretary that he is not supported in the proposition, and as I had not heard of the question being settled I ask for information.

Secretary LONG. What I am saying is, I think the three bureaus are opposed to consolidation. The Bureau of Construction under its former chief was in favor of it, but not after I made my recommendation to Congress that the head of the consolidated bureau should be either an officer of the line or of the staff.

The CHAIRMAN. I will say I introduced the Department bill which was sent up in the last Congress, but the question has never been considered by the committee.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; in the Fifty-fifth and Fifty-sixth Congresses.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Was there any discussion about it?

The CHAIRMAN. The bill has never come up for consideration by the committee. It has never been voted upon.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. It was wise, by the expressions made, that it was not voted upon at that time.

Secretary LONG. It is not worth while to go into it now.

It seems to me that the retiring Secretary of the Navy has done all that he could to remedy this crying evil which he says entails unnecessary expense upon the Government, and it does seem to me that the committee of which I am a member might do well to heed the recommendations of the head of the Department and try to consolidate these bureaus for the purpose of saving expense. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the new Secretary of the Navy, young, active, vigorous, and with a reputation to make, may be more successful in his efforts to reform the naval establishment in respect to these different bureaus and place the whole upon a solid business basis.

As an illustration of the reckless way in which some of these bureaus send in their estimates, I will read briefly from the statement of Admiral Endicott of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. He sent in his estimates, which were so grossly excessive that he was notified that he must cut them down and that the committee would only allow what was absolutely necessary.

I will read extracts from only one page of his hearings. Others are almost similar. Starting at the bottom of page 3:

The CHAIRMAN. The next item is, "blacksmith shop for steam engineering, \$42,000."

Admiral ENDICOTT. That item can be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The next item is, "foundry for steam engineering, \$90,000."

Admiral ENDICOTT. That item can be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The next item is, "pattern shop for steam engineering, \$56,000."

Admiral ENDICOTT. That item can be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The next item is, "coppersmith shop for steam engineering, \$44,000."

Admiral ENDICOTT. I would let that item go out of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The next item is, "Power house and stack for steam engineering, \$35,000."

Admiral ENDICOTT. I think that item should remain in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The next item is, "Steel-plant building for construction and repair (to cost \$240,000), \$100,000."

Admiral ENDICOTT. I have consulted the constructor upon that item, and while it is a thing that ought to be done, it is not necessary at the present time. The constructor feels that if he has to give up anything he would rather give up items at Portsmouth and Boston.

The CHAIRMAN. The next item is, "Plate metal workers' shop for construction and repair, \$75,000." That is a new shop?

Admiral ENDICOTT. Yes, sir. I would let that item be stricken from the bill.

And so it goes. Some millions were struck out by the Committee on Naval Affairs. The Naval Committee is entitled to credit for sifting these estimates, but the recklessness with which these bureau officers, or some of them, send in their estimates to the Naval Committee is to be condemned. I insist upon it that the bureaus ought to be remodeled, that some of them ought to be consolidated, and that everything that comes to the Naval Committee ought to come with the sanction and indorsement of the head of the Department.

Mr. DAYTON. Will the gentleman pardon an interruption?

Mr. RIXEY. Certainly.

Mr. DAYTON. Do you mean to say that these estimates do not come to the head of the Navy Department?

Mr. RIXEY. I suppose they do come to the head of the Navy Department, but—

Mr. DAYTON. Are they not all examined by him and sent by him to the Naval Committee?

Mr. RIXEY. I can only state to you what I suppose would be the case from what I see in the hearings—that he has never examined them. He may have done so; if he has, it does not look very creditable to the head of the Navy Department, in my judgment.

Mr. DAYTON. Is it not very well known to the gentleman that while these estimates were cut down that none of them were for works that were not advisable and desirable in order to build up the naval establishment; and these changes were made, or these cuts were made, because the committee determined first that it would not engage in new constructions at navy-yards, or, at least, very little, and that Admiral Endicott was instructed that anything not thought advisable by him, looking to the future, that it must be cut out. Was not that his reason?

Mr. RIXEY. I am not a member of the subcommittee, but Admiral Endicott had been informed that the committee would not allow many of the items he sent up, and I think properly so informed; and when millions are cut out, it shows that he was reckless in his statements, as I understand it.

Mr. DAYTON. I hope the gentleman will pardon me. I know he does not want to be unfair, and he is not just to Admiral Endicott in the statement that he has made.

Mr. RIXEY. I will permit the gentleman to ask a question, but when the gentleman proposes to lecture me I shall not permit that.

Mr. DAYTON. You know he represents all the different branches of the Navy Department in public works, do you not?

Mr. RIXEY. I understand he does.

Mr. DAYTON. You know that the reasons for these different items coming from the different bureaus is because these buildings were desirable and wanted?

Mr. RIXEY. No; I do not know anything of the kind.

Mr. DAYTON. You admit you are not a member of the subcommittee?

Mr. RIXEY. Certainly. I can not yield to my friend for him to make a speech in my time.

Mr. DAYTON. I simply want you to do justice to an honorable man in what you say.

Mr. RIXEY. I have no doubt Admiral Endicott is a first-class man in his profession; but anyone who will take these estimates must come to the conclusion, in my judgment, that he was reckless in stating what he desired. That there never was any necessity for making these appropriations is shown by the fact that the Naval Committee has cut them down some million dollars. In addition to this, Mr. Chairman, I have a statement here, and I am sorry that the gentleman from West Virginia has left.

Mr. DAYTON. I am here.

Mr. RIXEY. I have a statement here from Admiral Bradford, in which he says, so far as he knows, there is no reason for the very great increase in the Bureau of Construction and Repair.

Mr. DAYTON. I did not hear the statement.

Mr. RIXEY. The statement is this, that Admiral Bradford has stated, and he is the chief of one of the bureaus, that he knows of no reason for the great increase in another one of these bureaus; that is, the Bureau of Construction and Repair.

Mr. DAYTON. Will the gentleman point to that statement? I have no recollection of it.

Mr. RIXEY. I will read it to you. In the hearings Admiral Bradford said:

The average appropriation, not including "Increase of the Navy" salaries, and public works, for the Bureaus of Equipment, Construction and Repair, Steam Engineering, and Ordnance, from 1890 to 1897, inclusive, was as follows:

Bureau of Equipment.....	\$1,170,252.29
Bureau of Construction and Repair.....	1,262,222.50
Bureau of Steam Engineering.....	849,032.52
Bureau of Ordnance.....	412,153.00

Average for the same bureaus from 1898 to 1903, inclusive.

Bureau of Equipment.....	\$3,608,752.08
Bureau of Construction and Repair.....	5,784,081.50
Bureau of Steam Engineering.....	3,115,800.00
Bureau of Ordnance.....	3,360,415.00

Per cent of increase in appropriation for these bureaus for the second period.

Bureau of Equipment.....	3.09
Bureau of Construction and Repair.....	4.58
Bureau of Steam Engineering.....	3.67
Bureau of Ordnance.....	8.01

Attention is called to the fact that the average appropriation for the Bureau of Equipment and Bureau of Construction and Repair for the first period was about the same, being a little larger (less than \$100,000) for the Bureau of Construction and Repair. For the second period, however, the average appropriation for the Bureau of Construction and Repair is 60 per cent greater than that for the Bureau of Equipment. So far as I am aware, there is no reason why the same relative expenditures for the two bureaus should not exist to-day as formerly. Attention is called to these expenditures only as an indication of the care that has been exercised by the Bureau of Equipment in the expenditure of money.

Now, it will be seen that Admiral Bradford says that there is no reason for the 60 per cent increase.

Mr. DAYTON. So far as he knows.

Mr. RIXEY. So far as he knows, and he ought to know, because he is at the head of the Bureau of Equipment.

Mr. DAYTON. But not at the head of the Bureau of Construction and Repair.

Mr. RIXEY. Certainly not; but, as the former Secretary of the Navy suggested, the Bureau of Equipment and the Bureau of Construction and Repair should be consolidated.

Now I will read a little further from Admiral Bradford's statement:

The appropriations, not including "Increase of the Navy," salaries, and public works, for the Bureaus of Equipment, Construction and Repair, Steam Engineering, and Ordnance for the fiscal year 1902 were as follows:

Bureau of Equipment.....	\$3,985,000
Bureau of Construction and Repair.....	7,335,000
Bureau of Steam Engineering.....	3,446,000
Bureau of Ordnance.....	2,481,749

Similar estimates of same bureaus for fiscal year 1903.

Bureau of Equipment.....	\$4,985,000
Bureau of Construction and Repair.....	9,470,000
Bureau of Steam Engineering.....	4,206,000
Bureau of Ordnance.....	3,403,000

Now, Admiral Bradford states that he knows no reason why the same relative proportion should not exist to-day that existed then, and yet the estimates and appropriations for the Bureau of Construction and Repair are now 100 per cent more than for the Bureau of Equipment.

Under such circumstances, Mr. Chairman, it is no wonder that protests come to this House from conservative sources. I suppose every member of this House has received a protest signed by 135 prominent citizens of Boston protesting against any such great expenditures as were estimated for, but which have been cut down to some extent. The protest is as follows:

Citizens of Boston and vicinity, without reference to party relations, have united in this remonstrance against the proposed vast increase of naval expenditures:

To the President, the Secretary of the Navy, and the members of Congress:

We regret to learn that the estimates for the Navy for the coming fiscal year aggregate nearly \$100,000,000.

This is about five times the amount expended only ten years ago. The new estimates amount to an average cost of over \$6 for every family in the country. Half this sum applied to education would support 5,000 manual training schools, at nearly \$10,000 apiece, throughout the United States.

We believe that it is a needless extravagance to take for this purpose anything like one hundred millions out of the pockets of the people.

We hold that the maintenance of a vast machinery of war is not only a serious burden upon the people, but a positive menace to the peace of the world.

For more than a hundred years the United States has borne the honorable tradition of a nation which had no need of great armaments. We urge all who believe in justice, good will, and humanity as the great safeguards of the interests of the nation to exert their influence to maintain this high distinction.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will take but a short time to consider another question which was considered at length by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and that is the question of where we are to build the ships authorized in this bill. The chairman of the committee challenged a statement sent out from certain sources that the navy-yards have cost upward of \$100,000,000. I believe, however, he admitted that they have cost from seventy to eighty million dollars. I understand that the 46 private shipyards of the country have cost about \$68,000,000. Our 10 navy-yards have cost certainly \$70,000,000 and perhaps \$100,000,000. The 46 private yards have cost about \$68,000,000.

Now, I want to ask that if these 46 contractors, with their shipyards costing on an average a million and a half dollars apiece, can build battle ships, can not our 10 navy-yards, costing on the average of from seven to ten millions, also build them? Tell me they can not build as cheaply as contractors! Why, sir, the plant is already provided; the Government pays no interest upon it; it pays no insurance; the constructors are educated by the Government at Annapolis; it has the very best talent in the country; and you tell me that the Government, with these plants all provided, with the men trained for the purpose, with no interest and no insurance to pay, can not build ships as cheap as contractors who have to provide interest on their plant and insurance and profits! Such a claim is not creditable to the Navy Department nor to any portion of it from its chief down to the laboring man employed by the Department at the navy-yards.

The chairman of the committee, as I understood it, contended that one reason was that the men in the employ of the Government only worked eight hours, whereas the private shipyards worked their men ten hours. I want to remind him that that reason is likely to be removed; that the Committee on Labor of this House has reported a bill providing that no contractor shall work laborers longer than eight hours upon Government work. So far as that goes that is likely to be avoided in the future.

Mr. SULZER. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that some of the best ships in the Navy have been built in the Government shipyards?

Mr. RIXEY. Four of them, I think, have been built in the Government shipyards. The illustration and the comparison which the gentleman from Illinois makes in regard to ships heretofore built in the navy-yards are unfair. When the *Maine* and the *Texas* were built the privilege was given to the contractors to take the contract upon the limit fixed by Congress. They declined to take the contract, and the Government was compelled to build these ships at its navy-yards. It had to build them at a time when the navy-yards were not equipped as they are now. It had to build them when it was not prepared properly for the work. Hence it is unfair to make such a comparison at this time.

But if it were fair, Mr. Chairman, let us see how the prices charged by contractors themselves have varied. In 1890, when only two concerns were competing for construction of ships, it cost to build the *Indiana* \$579 per ton. Five years later, when the Newport News Company was in the field, the *Kearsarge* was built for \$334 per ton, involving a difference of \$1,673,000 on a single ship.

In 1888 the Columbian Iron Works built the hull and machinery of the *Montgomery* for \$486 per ton. In 1893 the Newport News Company built the hull and machinery of the *Helena* and the *Nashville* for \$200 per ton—a difference of \$286 per ton as compared with the cost of building the *Montgomery*. In 1895 the *Oregon* cost \$610 per ton; but the same contracting parties were willing to build the new *Maine* for \$404 per ton, and the *Wisconsin* for \$393 per ton. The contract for building the *Virginia* was given to the Newport News Company at \$478 per ton. The same company built the *Kearsarge* and the *Kentucky* at \$317 per ton—a difference of over a million dollars on a single ship.

When you come to compare the cost of building ships you will see that they vary under many conditions. I take it that the cost of building ships in Government yards now can not be estimated by what it cost in 1888.

Again, in regard to the building of the *Maine* and the *Texas*, Constructor Bowles testified that many things which he had to have in the navy-yard were bought by the Government and charged to the *Texas*. I remember that as to one piece of machinery he was asked where it was charged, and he said it was charged to the *Texas*. He was then asked where that machinery was now, and he answered: "It is still in the navy-yard and doing good work." It is unfair to take the cost of building the *Texas* in 1888 as an indication of what it would cost to build such a vessel at the present time.

A great deal has been said by the gentleman from Illinois in regard to the agitation for this matter having been stirred up by the Chamber of Commerce of Vallejo, Cal. I remind the gentleman that this agitation for the building of ships in our navy-yards did not originate with that chamber of commerce. I will remind him that two years ago when there was a minority re-

port filed from the Committee on Naval Affairs one of the contentions was that while the Government had these vast and valuable navy-yards it ought to utilize them by building some of its ships in them.

In regard to these cards of the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce which have been sent out, and which the chairman of the committee has so vigorously attacked, I did not expect to say anything about them. So far as I know, they contain a great deal of information and a great many facts. In one of the hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs, Mr. O'Connell, who is the head of one of the labor organizations, was asked by one of the members of the committee whether the statements made in these cards were correct. He said "Yes." He was then asked, "How do you know?" And he replied, "Because I have examined the reports at the Navy Department, and I know the statements made in those cards to be true."

Mr. Chairman, that was the time to deny the correctness of those statements; that was the time when Admiral Bowles or anyone else desiring to deny those statements of fact could have sent his denial to the committee, without waiting until this bill was called up for consideration in the House, and then, for the first time, sending here written statements which have been seen by no one but the chairman of the committee, certainly not by the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, it is admitted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] that three years ago Admiral Bowles, who was then constructor, advocated the building of ships in the navy-yards, and he says of course constructors favor the building of ships in navy-yards. It seems to me this is rather an unnecessary reflection upon Admiral Bowles. I might as well say, "Of course, since he has been elevated to the official family of the Secretary of the Navy and become the head of the Bureau, that he partakes, without reasons for his change of opinion, of the views and opinions of the other chiefs of the bureaus." But, sir, I do not charge that Admiral Bowles has changed his opinion simply because he is elevated to the position at the head of the Bureau, and I insist upon it that his opinion as constructor is as valuable as his present opinion at the head of the Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to his testimony, while he was a constructor and the head of one of the navy-yards, I would refer briefly to his testimony before the Naval Committee since he has been at the head of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, and I state that in that testimony he again recommends the building of ships in the navy-yards. Admiral Bowles was asked by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. DAYTON] if the building of a small vessel in the navy-yards, as a practical test, would not be sufficient. He replied:

I do not think any such test would amount to anything. I think there is a pretty good evidence of the question already. I believe that if this Government finds it necessary and desirable to build ships in the navy-yards as a matter of regular practice that we can do it as economically and as well as it can be done by contract—

Now, this is the opinion of Admiral Bowles since he has been at the Navy Department—

but we must be free from any embarrassment in the way of leaves of absence. As a proof of it I will say it is being regularly done now in the English dockyards. They are building now a little more than they ever have, and they are keeping the cost down lower than the contract price in the private yards.

Now, one reason given by the gentleman from Illinois for the fact, as he stated, that England could build ships in her navy-yards cheaper than she could by private contracts, and that we could not do so, was that there the price in the navy-yard was less than it was in the contractor's yard. I do not know as to these facts, but as I understand it the law here is that instead of the price in the navy-yards being from 30 to 40 per cent higher, it requires the price of the navy-yard to be gauged by what it is in the neighborhood. As a matter of fact, the price paid mechanics at Norfolk is less than the price paid at Brooklyn Navy-Yard, and the reason is that the price paid to mechanics outside of the navy-yard in New York is greater than that paid them in Norfolk. There is no reason why they should be greater. Admiral Bowles again says, in response to a question by Mr. TAYLER:

Could you repair with more economy if you were constructing?
Admiral BOWLES. Yes.

In other words, we would gain not only in the building of the vessels, but we would save money in the repairing of them.

When you say that, you mean you would get a larger force and keep them constantly at work?
Admiral BOWLES. Yes.

This testimony is emphatically that it is to the interest of this Government to build at least a portion of our ships in the navy-yards. Another witness relied upon to some extent by those who oppose the building of ships in the navy-yards was Admiral O'Neil, who, I believe, a few years ago was opposed to navy-yard

construction, but when he was asked by the committee what his opinion now was, he replied, the question being by Mr. DAYTON:

There is one other question I would like to ask you. I think you were interrogated a couple of years ago as to the wisdom of building ships in the navy-yards or by private contracts.

Admiral O'NEIL. Yes.

Mr. DAYTON. Have you changed your views in regard to that?

Admiral O'NEIL. I don't remember what I said on that occasion. There used to be a provision in the naval appropriation bill that if, when the bids were opened, the Secretary found they could not be advantageously let, he was authorized to build one or more vessels at the navy-yards. That, however, was afterwards taken out of the bill. There is no doubt that the last time they got together on bids.

From this it seems the admiral is of the opinion that the contractors got together, made a combination, that they took the contracts for the battle ships and armored cruisers, costing from six to seven millions each, and divided them among themselves—no competitions in such a case to protect the Government:

The CHAIRMAN. It cost you a good deal to build them in the navy-yards? Admiral O'NEIL. Yes; I think they can build ships now in the navy-yards as cheap as outside, because there is no question of profit; there is no question of interest on the investment, which is a great feature in private work. On the other hand, they have not the money incentive to expedite work, which incentive exists in the case of the private shipbuilder. No navy-yard could do to-day any worse than half of the private shipbuilders on the question of time.

Again the chairman says:

Would we not have to spend a good deal of time to get the navy-yards ready to build ships?

Admiral O'NEIL. No; the New York Navy-Yard can build a ship now.

Mr. DAYTON. We have to run the risk of carrying our own insurance?

Admiral O'NEIL. Yes.

Mr. DAYTON. We have to run the risk of the finished product being a failure instead of a success?

Admiral O'NEIL. Yes.

Mr. DAYTON. And we have to be governed by the eight-hour labor law?

Admiral O'NEIL. Yes; but that is getting pretty close to outside concerns now, with the laboring organizations and all that.

Mr. DAYTON. They run ten hours, I think. And on the question of the finished product, you think that the products of the navy-yards would be just as good?

Admiral O'NEIL. Yes; I think we would get a better product. It may cost a little more, but it ought not to if the work is carried on conscientiously.

Now, here is the opinion of Admiral O'Neil, who is one of the most experienced chiefs in the Navy Department, stating that the product will be better; that we can do as well or better in the matter of time, and that we can build as cheaply in the navy-yards as we can outside. I say the preponderance of the evidence in favor of the building Government ships in the navy-yards is overwhelming. In addition to this, we have the testimony of Constructor Stahl, of the Norfolk yard; of Constructor Baxter, of the Boston yard, and of the representatives of all the labor organizations in this country, without an exception.

Mr. MAYNARD. Constructor Stahl is stationed at the Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company, where the Government is building some ships.

Mr. RIXEY. Gentlemen insist that we are not in condition in the navy-yards to build ships. If we are not, then it is the fault of the people who have had charge of these yards. During the past year, as I understand it, we appropriated \$10,000,000 to keep these yards in order. These yards have each cost us an average of from \$7,000,000 to \$10,000,000. Now, I read from an advertisement of one of the contractors, who has the contracts for building two battle ships, the *New Jersey* and the *Rhode Island*; one cruiser, the *Des Moines*, and two torpedo-boat destroyers. Let us see what is the value of his plant. I have his advertisement here. It first quotes from a communication by Benjamin Brooks in the Transcript, made a part of the advertisement:

If you would behold the American spirit in its purest, strongest, and most buoyant phase, catch it on the wing, so to speak, learn the rate at which things under its inspiring influence can be made to happen, and see how truly robust and promising an infant is a shipbuilding plant, reared under its guidance, at the tender age of twenty-two months, go to Fore River.

At Fore River two things have been going on—the building of ships and the installing of a plant to build them. Logically, the plant should come first, of course, but as a matter of fact the two enterprises have been carried on, so side by side and intermingled that the ships, during the confusion, have managed somehow to come out ahead. This is most distinctly an American way of doing things—to start at nothing, to keep moving at all hazard, and decide upon conveniences and methods afterwards.

No even-minded European could ever proceed in such a manner, yet the scheme is a good one, economical, and not without foresight.

This distinctly American spur-of-the-moment way of getting a great plant together is one of the principal reasons for our being so many years ahead of the rest of the mechanical world.

There is at present outstanding \$1,000,000 of preferred stock and \$1,000,000 of common stock issued against a plant which has cost \$1,500,000.

This plant, which is only twenty-two months old, costing a million and a half dollars, located at Fore River, Quincy, Mass., has contracts from the Government for the building of two battle ships, one cruiser, and two torpedo-boat destroyers. If this plant, twenty-two months old, with its million and a half capital, can build all these great ships at one and the same time, do not tell me that the New York Navy-Yard, with its plant valued at \$20,000,000; the Norfolk Navy-Yard, with a plant valued at \$6,000,000; the

Mare Island Navy-Yard, valued at about the same amount, and the Boston Navy-Yard, valued at about the same amount, can not build them.

I say that if these shipbuilding concerns all over the country can build them and build them upon a profit, surely this Government, with its navy-yards all paid for and in complete order and kept so for the purpose of repairing ships, surely this Government, I say, can build its own ships in its navy-yards at less cost than can be done outside.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Has this Government ever built a first-class battle ship at any of its navy-yards?

Mr. RIXEY. It built the *Texas* at Norfolk and the *Maine* at Brooklyn.

Mr. MAYNARD. The *Texas* was a second-class battle ship.

Mr. RIXEY. The *Texas* was a second-class battle ship.

Mr. MAYNARD. They have never tried to build a first-class battle ship at a Government navy-yard.

Mr. RIXEY. The testimony is overwhelming that they can do it. Now, I believe there is no difference of opinion as to the ability of this Government to build its ships. As to the advisability of it there may be some little difference of opinion.

I have read what Admiral Bowles said when he was a constructor. I have read what he stated when he was called before the Naval Committee, giving it as his opinion that we ought to build at least a portion of the ships in the navy-yards; and it was further stated, either by Admiral Bowles or some one else, that England builds the majority of her ships in her navy-yards; that France is building 50 per cent of hers, and that Russia is making an effort to build all of hers in her navy-yards.

When the Secretary of the Navy was heard before the Naval Committee on the 19th of April, just before he went out of office, he gave it as his opinion that ships ought not to be built in the Government navy-yards; and it may be due to the fact of the opposition of the late Secretary of the Navy that the whole Navy Department has for years been opposed to the building of any ships in the Government navy-yards. When he was before the committee, and after Admiral Bowles had already been heard, the Secretary stated that he desired to file certain statements of Admiral Bowles.

In these letters—two to the Secretary of the Navy and two addressed to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. DAYTON]—Admiral Bowles gives it as his opinion that it will cost 25 per cent more to build vessels in the Government yards than it will to build them in the contractors' yards. Against this belated statement of Admiral Bowles, which comes in without any call on the part of the Navy Committee, and after he has twice testified—against that we place the testimony of every constructor who was called by the Naval Committee. In addition to that, I desire to give the opinion of Admiral Hichborn; and I take it that the House will agree with me that there has never been a better informed head of the Bureau of Construction and Repair than Admiral Hichborn.

In his last annual report to the Secretary of the Navy, which was sent to the House, he strongly advocates building ships in navy-yards. This was just before he left the Bureau. His recommendation is as follows:

Much has been said both in favor of and against the building of vessels in the navy-yards. The progress made in the improvement of yard plants and the ever-increasing need for a permanent skilled force ready for and capable of at all times taking up repairs of any character which the growth in "materiel" of the Navy entails makes it desirable that the question should be given careful consideration.

There is at the present time, in view of the prosperous condition of the shipbuilding industry and the number of naval vessels building and appropriated for, sufficient work to permit the assignment of a portion of the building work to the Government yards without there being a question of the withdrawal or withholding of necessary support and assistance through work given out to a private industry, the maintenance of which in a high state of efficiency is unquestionably of national importance. These conditions make it possible to eliminate from the discussion any questions of policy except such as affect economy and efficiency.

It has been the history of all the iron and steel navies in existence to-day that the building of the vessels was at first entirely confided to private industry, and that the existence of the nucleus of a steel fleet made it necessary that the governments who were their owners should themselves provide for repairing these vessels; and that, having provided the necessary plant for this purpose, the provision for the maintenance of the equally necessary though vastly more difficult thing to attain, viz, efficient working organization and adequate efficient personnel, forced them to undertake in their navy-yards a portion of the new building work.

Then, he says, England is building in her navy-yards 8 battle ships and 5 armored cruisers; France is building in her navy-yards 3 battle ships and 10 armored cruisers; Germany is building in her navy-yards 3 battle ships and 1 armored cruiser; Russia is building in her navy-yards 3 battle ships and 1 armored cruiser.

He goes on:

In the case of many of the European nations—for example, Denmark and Holland, maintaining smaller navies—so strongly is this necessity for a permanent, efficient navy-yard personnel felt that practically all the naval building work undertaken by them is carried out at their navy-yards.

What they have done and are doing is mentioned here solely to emphasize the fact that the unanimous testimony of experience has been and is that the execution of a certain amount of building work at the chief Government yards is necessary to the maintenance of such navy-yard staffs as a complete and efficient naval organization requires; and that, whatever disadvantages such a course entails, they are more than compensated for in the end. It is believed that we have reached that stage in a naval development—still considerably behind our national development—which forces upon us serious consideration of this step which other naval powers have found necessary and expedient. At the outset the disadvantages to be labored under will be considerable.

Time and experience will do much toward the alleviation or, possibly, the entire removal of many of these. While under existing conditions, in the case of the first vessels built in our navy-yards it may be expected that the cost will not be greatly different from—may even be somewhat greater than for—the same work executed by contract in the private shipyards, the Bureau believes that such a course once entered upon would demonstrate its desirability and practicability in an increased efficiency and economy in naval administration, regarded as a whole, without interference with a judicious policy of such Government encouragement of the shipbuilding industry as will keep the greatest number of establishments in a position to undertake and execute promptly any naval work which may be required.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the time has come to commence building ships in the navy-yards. The contractors are now building for the Government 59 ships. Twenty-seven of these ships will cost \$117,000,000. All of these 59 ships are at present given out to contract, and Admiral O'Neil testifies that they will not be ready for delivery to the Government for two or three years. Why can not we at this time, when the private yards already have 59 of the Government ships, costing probably as much as \$150,000,000, why can not we build the 4 great ships authorized by this bill in the navy-yards of this country?

The testimony taken by the Naval Committee shows that the navy-yards of this country are running not over one-half of their capacity; that when a ship comes in for repair they employ men, and when the ship is finished those men are discharged. They have difficulty in keeping up the force in the navy-yards. Let us give the 4 principal yards in this country the 2 battle ships and 2 armored cruisers authorized in this bill, and let us give them something to do, to give them continuous work, and I take it that not only will the repair work be done in a more satisfactory manner, but I believe these battle ships and armored cruisers will be the pride of this country and equal to anything that the shipbuilding yards have ever constructed. [Loud applause.]

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 14046 and had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE RESIGNATIONS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications; which were read:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May —, 1902.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEAR SIR: I hereby resign my position as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Yours, respectfully,

FRED. H. GILLETT.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1902.

Hon. DAVID B. HENDERSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR SIR: I have the honor to hereby resign my position as a member of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

Very respectfully, yours,

MARLIN E. OLMSTED.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 8, 1902.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MY DEAR SIR: I have the honor hereby to resign my position as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

ADIN B. CAPRON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, these several requests will be granted. The Chair hears no objection.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS.

The SPEAKER announced the following committee assignments:

Foreign Affairs—Mr. CAPRON, of Rhode Island.

Insular Affairs—Mr. OLMSTED, of Pennsylvania.

Naval Affairs—Mr. LESSLER, of New York.

Banking and Currency—Mr. MOSS, of Kentucky.

Revision of the Laws—Mr. TIRRELL, of Massachusetts.

ENROLLED BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. R. 74. Joint resolution relating to publications of the Geological Survey;

S. 5736. An act for the relief of the French West Indies;

S. 2036. An act granting an increase of pension to Etta Adair Anderson;

S. 182. An act granting a pension to Mary F. Zollinger;

S. 2330. An act granting a pension to Rebecca Coppinger;

S. 288. An act granting an increase of pension to De Witt C. Bennett;

S. 500. An act granting a pension to Samuel S. Beaver;

S. 1305. An act for the relief of Mrs. Arivella D. Meeker;

S. 2632. An act to amend an act entitled "An act granting to the Clearwater Valley Railroad Company a right of way through the Nez Percés Indian land in Idaho;"

S. 1593. An act granting an increase of pension to Eben C. Winslow;

S. 2461. An act granting an increase of pension to George McDowell;

S. 2347. An act granting an increase of pension to Alfred M. Wheeler;

S. 2755. An act granting a pension to Ruth H. Ferguson;

S. 3279. An act granting a pension to John Coolen;

S. 4004. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Nelson;

S. 3331. An act granting a pension to Ada V. Park;

S. 3999. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma S. Hanna;

S. 4238. An act granting an increase of pension to Philo F. Englesby;

S. 4256. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Edens;

S. 4293. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Vincent;

S. 4455. An act granting an increase of pension to Hallowell Goddard;

S. 4506. An act granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Collier;

S. 4865. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Hazzard;

S. 4979. An act granting an increase of pension to Paul Fuchs;

S. 4992. An act to provide an American register for the bark *Otto Geldemeister*;

S. 5294. An act granting an increase of pension to William F. Horn;

S. 5337. An act granting an increase of pension to Maretta L. Adams; and

S. 4455. An act granting an increase of pension to Hallowell Goddard.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 5735. An act to fix the compensation of criers and bailiffs in the United States courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. R. 98. Joint resolution appropriating the sum of \$500,000, including the \$200,000 already appropriated, for the relief of the French West Indies and St. Vincent—to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DEEMER, for remainder of the week, on account of important business.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4777) to authorize the Nashville Terminal Company to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River, in Davidson County, Tenn., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2018); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1992) granting the right of way to the Alafia, Manatee and Gulf Coast Railway Company through the United States light-house and military reservations on Gasparilla Island, in the State of Florida, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2019); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18735) providing for the selection and retirement of medical officers in the Army, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2020); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3360) for the promotion of First Lieut. Joseph M. Simms, Revenue-Cutter Service, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1991); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14221) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. McArthur, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1992); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11339) granting a pension to Augustus Blount, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1993); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11453) granting a pension to Catharine Freeman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1994); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11865) granting an increase of pension to John A. Robertson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1995); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12424) granting an increase of pension to Wallace K. May, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1996); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12632) granting an increase of pension to Bailey O. Bowden, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1997); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14052) granting an increase of pension to George Fusselman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1998); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13227) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Emry, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1999); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3768) granting an increase of pension to John W. Campbell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2000); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5205) granting an increase of pension to Hiram S. Leffingwell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2001); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6991) granting an increase of pension to Esek B. Chandler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2002); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8146)

granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Owens, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2003); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5446) granting a pension to James M. Travis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2004); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9710) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Eagon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2005); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3770) granting a pension to J. E. Dickey, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2006); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8780) granting an increase of pension to Pierson L. Shick, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2007); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12009) granting an increase of pension to George Baker, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2008); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12019) granting an increase of pension to William Lowe, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2009); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14087) granting a pension to Lizzie Dunlap, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2010); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14144) granting an increase of pension to Fannie S. Cross, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2011); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10174) granting a pension to Jennie M. Harris, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2012); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11250) granting an increase of pension to Arthur L. Currie, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2013); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1797) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Russell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2014); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3888) granting an increase of pension to Jesse H. Hubbard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2015); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5371) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan O. Thompson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2016); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DICK, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2921) to place Henry Biederbick, Julius R. Frederick, Francis Long, and Maurice Connell on the retired list of enlisted men of the Army, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2017); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 14382) to purchase the McLean property and other property at Appomattox, in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RODEY: A bill (H. R. 14383) to validate certain acts

of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico with reference to the issuance of certain bonds—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SKILES: A bill (H. R. 14384) providing for a life-saving station at the mouth of Black River, at or near the city of Lorain, Lorain County, in the State of Ohio, and for life-saving crew, and so forth—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 14385) to extend to the city of Paducah the operation of an act entitled "An act to amend an act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLEARY: A bill (H. R. 14386) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 14387) to provide for the opening and closing of alleys and the opening of minor streets in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 14388) granting an increase of pension to Graham McClosson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 14389) for the relief of the heirs of Joel S. Calvert—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14390) granting an increase of pension to George W. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 14391) granting an increase of pension to Edward Walsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDDY: A bill (H. R. 14392) for the relief of the estate of Ramsay Crooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14393) for the relief of Ramsay Crooks—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 14394) granting pensions to Mahala J. Binckley and Minnie A. Binckley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14395) granting a pension to William Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 14396) granting a pension to Robert Lappin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14397) granting an increase of pension to George Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 14398) granting an increase of pension to David M. Shopstaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 14399) granting an increase of pension to William L. Gerard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 14400) granting an increase of pension to Edward Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 14401) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Leaman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14402) granting an increase of pension to Alfred W. Morley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 14403) granting a pension to John A. Griffin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUGSLEY: A bill (H. R. 14404) for the relief of Theodore Teed, his heirs, legal representatives, or assigns—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14405) for the relief of Henry Moore—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 14406) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Eiseley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SKILES: A bill (H. R. 14407) granting a pension to May Jennings Bunn—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TONGUE: A bill (H. R. 14408) granting a pension to Benjamin McKee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 14409) to remove the charge of desertion from William A. Emerson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Resolutions of Buffalo (N. Y.) Merchants' Exchange, approving the reorganization of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEIDLER: Resolutions of United Trades and Labor Council of Cuyahoga County, Cleveland, Ohio, urging the use of local sandstone in the construction of new Federal building at Cleveland, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolutions of Columbus, Ohio, Credit Men's Association in regard to the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: Resolution of Port Arthur Laborers' Building Association, for more rigid restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CREAMER: Resolutions of Bricklayers' General Executive Board of Greater New York, favoring the passage of House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolutions of Engineers' Society of West-Pennsylvania, in favor of the metric system—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. HANBURY: Resolutions of Iron Trades Council of San Francisco, Cal., and the Republican Club of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the construction of Government vessels in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12283, for the relief of Christian Besserer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Seventh assembly district and Sixteenth assembly district Republican clubs of Brooklyn, N. Y.; Women's Republican Association of New York, and Storekeepers' Union No. 1, of New York, indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of Seventh assembly district Republican Club of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the passage of House bill 7930, to regulate the hours of labor of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Resolutions of United Mine Workers' Unions of Princeton and Evansville, Ind., favoring the restriction of the immigration of cheap labor from the south and east of Europe—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of German Liquor Dealers' Association, of Trenton, N. J., in favor of House bills 178 and 179, reducing the tax on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KERN: Resolutions of Zealous Lodge, No. 217, Locomotive Firemen, of East St. Louis, Ill., favoring the irrigation bill as amended by the Senate—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, resolutions of John D. Miley Camp, No. 20, Service Men in the Spanish War, of Belleville, Ill., favoring the Bell bill, allowing travel pay to volunteers from Manila, P. I., to San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of United Mine Workers' Union No. 750, of Lynn Station, Ill., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Iron Trade Council of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the construction of war vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of C. W. Hanscom and other citizens of Bath, Me., for repeal of the duties on beef, veal, mutton, and pork—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG: Protest of M. A. Webb and other citizens of Lyons, Kans., against House bill 6578, known as the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Newton, Kans., against the construction of a Pacific cable—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHONEY: Petitions of Singers' Society of the Holy Trinity and Casimir Jagiellonczyk Society, of Chicago, Ill., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MORRIS: Petitions of Post No. 40, of Sauk Center; Post No. 128, of Duluth; Post No. 2, of Anoka; Post No. 30, of Brainerd; Post No. 147, of Park Rapids; Post No. 52, of Monticello; Post No. 134, of St. Cloud, and Stanard Post, No. 161, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring House bill 8067, relating to pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Polish National Alliance Society, of Duluth, Minn., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Itasca Lodge, No. 401, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, Two Harbors, Minn., and Tailors' Union No. 97, of Duluth, Minn., favoring an educational restriction on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Petition of numerous voters of Steelton, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 1890, the per diem pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of General E. O. C. Ord Circle, No. 20, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Harrisburg, Pa., favoring a bill providing pensions to certain officers and men in the Army and Navy of the United States when 50 years of age and over, and increasing widows' pensions to \$12 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Petition of R. W. Shaw, of Cherokee County, Ala., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of the National Association of Retail Druggists, urging the immediate reduction of the internal-revenue tax on alcohol to 70 cents a gallon—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: Petitions of 1,800 citizens of Newcastle, 300 citizens of Euclid and West Liberty, and numerous churches in Lawrence County, Pa., for an amendment to the Constitution preventing polygamous marriages—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKILES: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to May E. Bunn, widow of Maj. George B. Bunn, deceased—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of A. W. James and others, of Morrow County, Ohio, for the passage of a service pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of Musicians' Mutual Benefit Association No. 41, of New York City, in favor of the proposed increase of pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Daniel E. Ryan and other citizens of New York City, for the repeal of the tariff on beef, veal, mutton, and pork—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIMBLE: Petitions of numerous citizens of Fayette County, Ky., and vicinity, in favor of House bills 178 and 179, for the repeal of the tax on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, May 14, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. ELKINS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of New River Division, No. 140, Order of Railway Conductors, of Hinton, W. Va., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington presented a petition of the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the granting of pensions to certain officers and enlisted men of the Life-Saving Service of the United States, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of Lodge No. 403, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Tacoma; of Mount Tacoma Division, No. 249, Order of Railway Conductors, of Tacoma, and of Puget Sound Lodge, No. 196, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Seattle, all in the State of Washington, praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a petition of the Merchants' Exchange of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to reorganize the consular service; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Division No. 167, Order of Railway Conductors, of Oswego, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Iron Trades Council of San

Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HARRIS presented the petition of C. Hoffman & Son, of Enterprise, Kans., and a petition of the Kelley Milling Company, of Kansas City, Mo., praying for the adoption of certain reciprocity treaties; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of Local Division No. 370, Order of Railway Conductors, of Providence, R. I., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of J. C. Nichols Post, No. 19, Department of Rhode Island, Grand Army of the Republic, of Rockland, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation providing pensions to certain officers and men in the Army and Navy of the United States when 50 years of age and over and increasing the pensions of widows of soldiers to \$12 per month; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Local Union No. 114, American Federation of Labor, of Providence, R. I., remonstrating against the adoption of certain amendments to the copyright law; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. WELLINGTON presented a petition of Patapsco Lodge, No. 432, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Baltimore, Md., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MITCHELL presented a petition of the Central Labor Council of Astoria, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the petition of G. B. Baird, of Shelbyville, Ind., and the petition of D. W. Edwards, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the improvement of the post exchanges; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petition of Charles F. Holler, of South Bend, Ind., and the petition of J. C. Martin, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in immigrant stations; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Sterling Remedy Company, of Kramer, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to section 4 of the act of June 13, 1898, making appropriation for the postal service, relative to second, third, and fourth class mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Dr. Moses H. Waters and sundry other physicians, of James P. Stunkard and sundry other attorneys, of Barker & Walsh and sundry other liquor dealers, of E. H. Bindley & Co. and sundry other wholesale druggists, and of C. W. West & Co. and sundry other retail druggists, all of Terre Haute, in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the internal-revenue law relative to the tax on distilled spirits; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented a petition of Still River Lodge, No. 493, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Danbury, Conn., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Grand Division, Sons of Temperance, of Connecticut, praying for an increase of the allowance for rations to the soldiers in the Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Fairfield, and Stratford, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the appointment of a commission to inquire into the condition of the colored people of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of Lincoln Division No. 206, Order of Railway Conductors, of Springfield, Ill., and a petition of Local Division No. 386, Order of Railway Conductors, of East St. Louis, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy"